THE FRUITS OF IOWA PROGRESSIVISM, 1900-1915

*By William L. Bowers**

During the early years of the twentieth century, many people in Iowa and the nation were concerned with the problem of coping concretely with the great power possessed by wealth and corporate influence — power too often wielded with little regard for the people. This popular state of mind, which protested against organized selfishness and which advocated definite change, was called "Progressivism." Its broad goal was to secure for the American people a fuller participation in shaping the laws and the protection of certain human rights basic to all men everywhere. Its chief manifestation was reform achieved through legislation. Some of its more important aims were: the regulation of corporate influence by laws which would provide for nominations at primary elections, the elimination of corporate political contributions, and the outlawing of free transportation and discriminatory rates; the placing of government more directly in the hands of the people through the use of the initiative, referendum, and recall; provisions for the popular election of United States Senators; pure food and drug legislation; the regulation of hours and conditions of female and child labor; the enactment of workmen's compensation and unemployment laws; woman suffrage; income and inheritance taxes; and the revision of the tariff rates.[1]

In Iowa, before the Progressive era, the Republican party was dominated by the Old Guard — the "Standpatters." Such men as William Boyd Allison, the "Wise Old Senator" who had served in the United States Senate since 1873; David B. Henderson, Speaker of the House of Representatives from 1889 to 1902; and William Peters Hepburn, Congressman from the Eighth District, provided Standpat leadership in Washington. Many would

*William L. Bowers is a graduate student in the history department at the State University of Iowa. This article is based on an M.A. thesis written at Iowa State Teachers College at Cedar Falls.

[1] This is the traditional definition of Progressivism as a revolt against the power and influence of the business community. For a vigorous interpretation stressing the economic and social conflict during the Progressive era, see Samuel P. Hays, *The Response to Industrialism: 1885-1914* (Chicago, 1957).

also place Senator Jonathan P. Dolliver in this group, but recent research shows that although he did align himself with the Standpatters during the early part of his career, Dolliver definitely did not share their viewpoint from about 1898 to his death in 1910.[2]

Within the state, party control was dominated largely by two "railroad bosses," Joseph W. Blythe of the Burlington and Nathaniel M. Hubbard of the North Western. As railroad attorneys, these men subtly exerted political influence which brought most of Iowa's Republican strongholds under their control. A third member was added to the leadership of the Standpatters in Iowa in 1897 when Leslie M. Shaw, a Denison lawyer and banker, was elected governor.

Albert Baird Cummins was the undisputed leader of the Progressives in Iowa, but a number of able men supported him and shared in that leadership. Abraham B. Funk, editor of the Spirit Lake *Beacon* and member of the General Assembly, 1888-1894, was a vigorous supporter of the movement from its beginning in Iowa. Funk clearly discerned the railroad bosses' relationship to Iowa politics and viewed Cummins and the group which he led as a means of breaking this corporate domination by the railroads. Other prominent supporters included Solomon F. Prouty, ex-district judge and Seventh District Congressman from 1911 to 1915; Emory H. English, newspaper editor and member of the General Assembly from 1902 to 1906; Smith W. Brookhart, member of Governor Cummins' staff and later his successor in the Senate; and Howard W. Byers, member of the General Assembly, 1893-1896, and Attorney General of Iowa in 1906.

The Progressive trend in public thinking was expressed in Iowa with the election of Albert Baird Cummins as governor in 1901. Cummins was an able and successful lawyer and a man of considerable individuality of thought and expression. Under his leadership as governor from 1901 to 1908, and through the efforts of numerous of his supporters, many of the aims of Progressivism were realized.[3] In 1908, upon the death of Senator Allison, Cummins at last realized his ambition to have a seat in the United States Senate, but the Standpatters elected their candidate, Beryl F. Carroll,

[2] Thomas Richard Ross, *Jonathan Prentiss Dolliver: A Study in Political Integrity and Independence* (Iowa City, 1958), *passim.*

[3] *Ibid.*, 216. Thomas J. Bray, Progressive Republican legislator, includes a lengthy list of men who supported Iowa Progressivism in his recently published book of reminiscences, *Rebirth of Freedom* (Indianola, Iowa, 1957), 115-16.

as governor, and the party division continued. Many of the goals of Progressivism in Iowa had been achieved by this time, however, and with the advent of World War I and America's involvement in it, Progressive sentiment in Iowa, and America, was eclipsed.

The program of Progressivism in Iowa sought to fulfill those demands for change which in their beginnings were centered chiefly in the agrarian discontent of the nineteenth century, but which by 1900 had enlarged and were actually being advocated by the public at large. The primary spokesmen of this public impulse were the leaders of the Progressive faction of the Republican party in Iowa.

These men protested against corporate influence in politics and certain corporate practices inimical to the public good. They viewed the practice of hiring lobbyists to influence legislation, of contributing money to influence elections, of "stock watering," and of using the free pass to influence legislators as particularly offensive.[4]

A primary election law was another item placed high on the list of objectives by these Iowa Progressives. Agitation for election reform had started in the nineteenth century, and although some progress was made when the Australian ballot was adopted in 1892, fraud, intimidation, and imposition still prevailed to a degree hardly tolerable at the turn of the century. A primary law was therefore sought as a more fair and honest method of nominating candidates.[5]

Iowa Progressives also gave attention to the railroad problem which, although it had received considerable attention during the 1870's and 1880's, still existed. The chief problems now were: (1) how to lessen the railroads' corporate influence; (2) how to apportion more adequately the tax load of the railroads; (3) abolition of the free pass; (4) establishment of a two-cent passenger rate; and (5) more efficient regulation of freight rates.[6]

[4] See the inaugurals and messages of Gov. Albert B. Cummins in Vol. I of *Iowa Documents* for each of the following years: *1902* (inaugural), 7, 12; *1904* (biennial), 27; *1906* (biennial), 23-4; *1907* (message), 18-19, 23-4; *1907* (inaugural), 11-13.

[5] Emory H. English, "Evolution in Iowa Voting Practices," *Annals of Iowa* (3rd ser.), 29:252-62 (April, 1948); Cummins' biennial messages, *Iowa Documents, 1904*, 1:15-16; *1906*, 1:11-14. Spirit Lake *Beacon*, Nov. 23, 1906; *ibid.*, quoted in Sioux City *Journal*, Jan. 15, 1906.

[6] Cummins' messages, *Iowa Documents, 1902* (inaugural), 1:16; *1906* (biennial), 1:14-15; Bray, *Rebirth of Freedom*, 20.

The subject of insurance and its regulation also entered into Progressive thinking in Iowa, because the elements of deceit and corruption connected with its operation were becoming intolerable. Progressives particularly sought standardization of forms and policies and an annual accounting to policyholders of their share in the surpluses of the company.[7]

Tariff reform and reciprocity were also subscribed to by Iowa Progressives. They contended that tariff rates were too high, afforded a climate for the growth of monopoly, and forced the consumer to pay higher prices. In both 1901 and 1906 Progressives were able to incorporate their position concerning the tariff into the Republican state platform. In the 1901 platform the tariff plank gained wide recognition as the "Iowa Idea."[8]

Still other reform objectives of Iowa Progressives were: educational reform, particularly the codification of the school laws; child labor legislation; penal reform, particularly an indeterminate sentence and the separation of juvenile lawbreakers from adult criminals in penal institutions; better liquor law enforcement; pure food and drug legislation; a direct inheritance tax; reform of the tax structure, particularly the establishment of a tax commission; acquisition of more direct government through the initiative and referendum; and improvement of the efficiency and moral fiber of city government.[9] This, then, briefly outlines the reform program Iowa Progressives laid out for themselves.

The Progressive movement in Iowa did not successfully enact all its program during the early twentieth century. However, Progressives were successful in achieving most of their purposes at that time. Today, hardly forty years later, the principles and demands of these earlier day Progressives have become an accepted reality, and indeed, now seem commonplace.

As for the failures of Progressivism, they were failures for the time being only in most cases. The struggle to carry out these demands for more regu-

[7] Cummins' biennial message, *Iowa Documents, 1906*, 1:9-10.

[8] George E. Roberts, "The Origins and History of the Iowa Idea," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, 2:62, 69-70, 72-8 (January, 1904); Republican State Platform, Cedar Falls *Daily Record*, Aug. 7, 1906; Cummins' inaugural messages, *Iowa Documents, 1902*, 1:10; *1904*, 1:9-10.

[9] Cummins' messages, *Iowa Documents, 1902* (inaugural), 1:19-23; *1904* (biennial), 1:13-15, 18-20; *1904* (inaugural), 1:11-16; *1906* (biennial), 1:19-23; *1907* (message), 1:10, 12, 15; Gov. Warren Garst's biennial message, *1909*, 1:7-8, 13, 23; Gov. George W. Clarke's inaugural message, *1913*, 1:15-16. See campaign speeches in Sioux City *Journal*, Oct. 23, 1901; Mason City *Times-Herald*, Oct. 4, 1901.

lation of business, for putting government more completely into the hands of the people, and for doing away with privileges and corruption was neither a short nor an easy one. The forces aligned against Progressivism were formidable and not readily overcome. Viewed in this light it would seem that the accomplishments of Progressivism in Iowa were more than most would have expected.

Regulation of the railroads had been a problem already tackled by the nineteenth century forerunners of Progressivism in Iowa. Other than the temporary success of 1874 and the more lasting success of 1888, no important legislation regulating the railroads had been passed before 1900. Successful legislation aimed at regulating the railroads of Iowa during the Progressive period can be grouped in four general categories: (1) legislation pertaining to more equitable railroad taxation; (2) legislation concerned with increasing the power and authority of the State Railroad Commission; (3) legislation which sought to eliminate the free pass system; and (4) legislation pertaining to the two-cent fare.[10]

Demands that the railroads be made to bear their fair share of the burden of taxation were strong in 1901. Taxes were then assessed by the Executive Council made up of the governor, the secretary of state, the state auditor, the state treasurer, and the secretary of agriculture. Thus the state officers elected in 1901 would have a say in taxing the railroads. The "railroad bosses" of Iowa, Blythe and Hubbard, were backing E. H. Conger for the gubernatorial nomination against Cummins. One Progressive editor commented:

> Blythe and Hubbard are bent on controlling the next governor of Iowa. Gilbertson and Martin, two members of the executive council, hold over next year, and both of them are in favor of compelling the railroads to pay their equitable share of taxation. Merriam, another member, is against any increase in valuation of the "Q" and the Northwestern, and if Blythe and Hubbard can select a governor who will do their will the council will be a tie next year, and the valuation will not be increased. That is why

[10] Although not in the form of "successful legislation," Iowa Progressivism's first victory in the struggle to regulate the railroads doing business in the state was scored in 1902 when Cummins vetoed Senate File 138, introduced by F. M. Molsberry and providing for amendment of the Code to increase the authorized indebtedness of "certain corporations" — in this case, the railroads. *Journal of the Iowa Senate, 1902*, 177, 786-91. (Hereafter cited as *Senate Journal*.)

> they opposed the nomination of Gilbertson and Martin last year; that is the reason they oppose Cummins; that is the cause of their present support of Conger. Rally around Cummins and defeat this shameful corporate influence.[11]

The fact that Blythe and Hubbard failed in their support of Conger, and that Cummins was nominated and elected in 1901, indicates the widespread Progressive sentiment in Iowa at that time.

In the 1902 session of the General Assembly, a bill sponsored by Emory H. English of Polk County was introduced and passed. This law required the railroads to report their gross earnings, net earnings (as computed by a uniform method to be used by all railroads operating in the state), and any other pertinent information to the Executive Council. Taxes would then be assessed accordingly. Failure to submit such reports would result in the Executive Council's assessing the tax according to available information and then adding a 25 per cent of taxable valuation penalty. In 1904 a law was passed which required railroads and other corporations owning real estate to report it to the Executive Council for assessment.[12] With the passage of these laws, demands for more equitable railroad taxation seem to have been satisfied, for no other important tax laws pertaining to the railroads were passed. During the Cummins administrations alone the railroads in Iowa had to pay $39,000 a year more to the state in taxes and $405,000 a year more to the counties as a result of this legislation.[13]

The Board of Railroad Commissioners, which had been created in the 1870's, had always been a rather weak regulatory power even though strengthened somewhat by the commission law of 1888. With this in mind, the twentieth century Progressives sought to increase the Board's power and authority. Not until the 1907 session of the General Assembly was any legislation passed giving increased power to the Commission, but in that year three laws were enacted. One of these laws gave the Commission authority to examine and inspect the condition of each railroad, its equipment, its bridges, and the manner of its conduct and management with regard to public safety and convenience. Equipment was to be put in proper order if

[11] Odebolt *Chronicle*, May 16, 1901.

[12] *Journal of the Iowa House, 1902*, House File 172. (Hereafter cited as *House Journal.*) *Laws of Iowa, 1902*, Chap. 61; *1904*, Chap. 46.

[13] Edward Lissner, "Iowa's Political War and Its Bearing Upon the Destiny of the Republican Party," *Harper's Weekly*, 50:550 (Apr. 21, 1906).

likely to affect the public safety. In the case of defective bridges, repairs were to be made within ten days, or the Commission could stop trains from using them. The law also gave the Commission authority to see that the railroads complied completely with their charters, and if they did not, the Board could serve notice and take civil action against them. Another of the 1907 laws gave the Commission the right to appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission in cases where railroads hauling freight from a point outside of the state into the state or vice versa were accused of charging unjust or unreasonable rates. The third 1907 law declared freight companies common carriers and placed them under the supervision of the Railroad Commission.[14]

In 1909 the Commission was given additional enforcement power with the right to impose a penalty of fifty dollars per day for every day that a railroad refused, failed, or neglected to obey its "rules, orders, and regulations."[15] After 1909 little more was done to enlarge the powers and authority of the Board of Railroad Commissioners, and with the coming of World War I and government control of the railroads, little more needed to be done, for the railroads were never again the powers that they had once been.

Probably the most vigorous struggle with the railroads during this time was concerned with the elimination of the free pass system. A resolution passed by the Forty-eighth Senatorial District Convention in 1901 is illustrative of the growing sentiment concerning this subject:

> We condemn the improper activities of larger corporations, existing under public charters in the effort to influence political actions for selfish purposes. To the end that these evils may be minimized we demand the enactment of legislation forbidding the distribution of free passes, franks, and similar favors such as too frequently pass as coin current in the purchase of political favors and influence.[16]

In 1902, when Progressivism was just getting started as far as legislation was concerned, only one bill was introduced dealing with the free pass. Two years later, however, four bills were introduced, indicating an ever increasing revulsion against the free pass system. None of these bills passed,

[14] *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chaps. 106, 108, 116.
[15] *Ibid., 1909*, Chap. 129.
[16] Sioux City *Journal*, May 22, 1901.

but by 1906 Progressivism had taken hold in the state, and an anti-free pass bill was enacted.[17] One Iowa editor commented on the new legislation:

> Very few people will ride on free passes over the railroads this year. The new rate law forbids any common carrier, subject to its provisions, to issue or give any interstate free ticket, free pass, or free transportation for passengers except to railway employees and officers and their families, and for certain specific classes of charitable work. Any common carrier violating the provision may be fined not less than $100 nor more than $1000, and any person accepting a pass in violation of it is subject to a like penalty. Therefore the free pass to influence legislation or to get business may be considered a thing of the past, so far as interstate business is concerned.[18]

However, the law did not prohibit the giving or accepting of free transportation to as many people as the foregoing statement would imply, nor to as many as some Progressives would have preferred.[19]

Therefore, in 1907, a new and more inclusive bill was introduced and passed, but its course was not an easy one, due to strong opposition and disagreement. Elbert W. Weeks of Guthrie, one of those voting against the measure, explained his position:

> I do not consider the provisions of this bill reasonable and just to the interests involved. It is, in my judgment, different from what other states have adopted and wholly unnecessary in this. I believe in just and equitable laws and we ought to enact them free from all political reasons, considering natural causes and conditions. We are apt, because we have the power, to go too far and do unwise things, violent, uncalled for and solely for political ad-

[17] *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 110; *1904*, H. F. 10, 198, 242; *Senate Journal, 1904*, S. F. 137; *1906*, S. F. 12; *Laws of Iowa, 1906*, Chap. 90.

[18] Waterloo *Daily Courier*, Jan. 2, 1907.

[19] Actually, the law reads: "An act making it unlawful for any steam railway or interurban railway doing business within the state, or any officer, agent or representative thereof, to issue, give or offer to any city, county, district, state or federal officer, including judges and members of the general assembly, or to any candidate to a political convention to use in attending such convention or return therefrom, or to any member of any political committee or employe thereof, or to any candidate for a city, county, district, state or federal office, or to jurors in state or federal courts, any free pass, ticket, or other privilege at rates less than charged the public." The law also made it illegal for those listed to accept such free passes or privileges. *Laws of Iowa, 1906*, Chap. 90.

> vantage, and fearing that some of these elements enter into this bill I believe it my duty to vote against it.[20]

The law, more comprehensive than the 1906 measure which it repealed, contained a detailed list of those to whom free passes were to be allowed and required that free pass beneficiaries be reported on a sworn statement each year.[21] With the enactment of this law, the political influence of the free pass was broken in Iowa, and the issue faded from the Iowa political scene.

Attempts by the Progressives to do something about the passenger rates charged by railroads started in 1904 when several bills were introduced in the Iowa legislature. One of these bills had the twofold purpose of abolishing the free pass and establishing a two-cent fare, but it died in committee. The other two bills aimed at providing for classification of the railroads and assignment of new rates based on the new classifications. One of these, House File 304, was enacted into law.[22] Nothing further was done by the 1906 legislature, but when the General Assembly met in 1907 no less than six bills concerned with passenger rates on railways were introduced. Only one of these, House File 220, which passed, amended two sections of the Code of Iowa and provided for the classification of all railroads in the state according to their gross earnings per mile within the state for the preceding year.[23] Class "A" included all railroads whose gross annual income per mile was $4,000 or more; class "B," those with earnings from $3,000 to $4,000; and class "C," those whose annual gross was less than $3,000. Railroads of class "A" were to charge no more than two cents per mile for all passengers above twelve years of age; class "B" railroads, no more than two and one-half cents per mile; class "C" railroads could continue to charge the three-cent per mile fare which had been the standard rate to that time.[24] This was the closest that Iowa legislators came to enacting a strict two-cent fare law for railroad passenger transportation during this period.

Closely related to passenger rates, and perhaps more of a problem in reality, were freight rates. The railroad law of 1888 had established a de-

[20] *House Journal, 1907*, H. F. 379.

[21] *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 112.

[22] *House Journal, 1904*, H. F. 198, 304; *Senate Journal, 1904*, S. F. 259; *Laws of Iowa, 1904*, Chap. 75.

[23] *House Journal, 1907*, H. F. 3, 6, 9, 13, 220; *Senate Journal, 1907*, S. F. 4.

[24] *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 102.

tailed schedule of freight rates which had served well, but discrimination in rates still persisted, and many Progressives believed that something should be done about the situation. Bills introduced in both houses of the 1902 General Assembly relating to freight-rate discrimination failed to pass, however.[25] The matter seemed to fade out as a really live issue until 1907, when a bill was introduced and passed to make appropriations to enable the State Railroad Commission to make an investigation of railroad freight rates.[26] The lack of specific measures dealing with the regulation of freight was undoubtedly due to the fact that much freight-rate regulation was obtained through the other 1907 bills which increased the power and authority of the Board of Railroad Commissioners.

As custodians of the public's money, insurance companies and their practices also came under the scrutiny of the Progressives in Iowa. With the ever widening scope of insurance operations at the turn of the century, more regulation was deemed necessary by most Progressives. Insurance companies were corporations, and certain questionable practices which made it easy for them and their agents to bilk and defraud the public were given particular attention, with the purpose of abolishing such practices within the state.

One of the goals of the twentieth century Progressive legislators was to compel fire insurance companies operating in Iowa to use a uniform policy which would definitely cut down on some of the fraudulent practices being used. Members of the 1902 General Assembly pushed this measure some, but with no success. Although five bills were introduced, none of them was passed. Unsuccessful attempts were made again in 1904 and 1906.[27] Then, in 1907, a bill introduced in the House by F. F. Jones of Montgomery County was passed and signed by the governor. This law made it illegal to use any policy form other than the standard one prescribed under penalty of a $50 to $100 fine for a first offense and a $100 to $200 fine for each subsequent offense.[28]

Another concern of Progressives in respect to insurance was the creation of a department of insurance with a commissioner to regulate insurance

[25] *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 199; *Senate Journal, 1902*, S. F. 4.

[26] *Senate Journal, 1907*, S. F. 224; *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 205.

[27] *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 356, 371; *1904*, H. F. 349; *Senate Journal, 1902*, S. F. 301, 312, 359; *1906*, S. F. 66, 92.

[28] *House Journal, 1907*, H. F. 49; *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 76.

companies in the state. Bills to that end were introduced in 1902, 1907, and 1909, but with no success.[29] Finally, in 1913, an Insurance Department and Insurance Commissioner were established, due in large degree to the persistent efforts of those who had done the groundwork.[30]

Other successes of the Progressives were achieved when, in 1904, several bills sponsored by Lorenzo D. Teter of Marion County and Emory H. English of Polk County, providing for approval of policies or contracts of life insurance companies, the examination of insurance companies, and the licensing of insurance companies and associations, were enacted into law.[31] The bill providing for the approval of policies required that all companies doing business within the state should file a copy of their policy with the auditor for approval or disapproval by either himself, the governor, or the attorney general. Upon disapproval by any one or all of these officials, the policy was not to be written or used in Iowa. The law providing for the examination of insurance companies stipulated that if, upon examination, a company were found to be insolvent or unsound or doing an illegal business, its certificate and right to do business in Iowa could be taken from it. The law in respect to the licensing of insurance companies and their agents imposed a penalty for acting without a license of $25 per day for every day of illegal operation.[32]

In 1906 the General Assembly provided for the creation of a legislative commission to examine the subject of insurance and the practices of insurance companies doing business in the state. The Commission was to be made up of five members — two senators and three representatives — and it was to have power to investigate thoroughly the practices of the insurance business in Iowa. An appropriation of $10,000 was approved for the expense of the inquiry, and recommendations, particularly in connection with the uniform policy, were to be made to the next legislature.[33] Nothing of great importance seems to have resulted, although, as already noted, several bills concerned with the uniform policy and establishment of an insurance department were introduced in the legislature the following year. Limitations upon the amount and kinds of risks that insurance companies

[29] *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 417; *1907*, H. F. 31; *Senate Journal, 1907*, S. F. 15.
[30] *Senate Journal, 1913*, S. F. 522; *Laws of Iowa, 1913*, Chap. 146.
[31] *House Journal, 1904*, H. F. 389, 144, 393. The last two of these bills were introduced by English. *Laws of Iowa, 1904*, Chap. 59, 56, 57, respectively.
[32] *Laws of Iowa, 1904*, Chaps. 56, 57, 59.
[33] *Ibid., 1906*, Chap. 188.

could cover were also set by law in 1906. Companies other than life insurance companies were limited to eight specified kinds of risks and were prohibited from insuring any risk for more than 10 per cent of its paid up capital. The legislature in 1907 passed a bill to amend the Code in respect to limitations of investment by insurance companies. Two other bills of importance, House File 275 and Senate File 42, were enacted into law also in that year.[34] House File 275 aimed to prohibit the misrepresentation of any life insurance policy either by false advertising or other means. Senate File 42 provided the conditions under which a company could operate upon the stock plan and fixed the minimum amount of capital stock for incorporation at $100,000. Then, with the establishment of the Insurance Department and provisions for an Insurance Commissioner in 1913, the larger aspects of the insurance problem were solved.

Regulation of corporations other than railroad and insurance companies was also sought by both reformers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Because Iowa was dominantly an agricultural state, the problem presented by the corporations, with the exception of the two types previously mentioned, was not as great as in some other states. Still, the activities and monopolistic tendencies of some corporations made themselves felt even in Iowa. With this problem in mind, legislators introduced a bill in the 1902 General Assembly to prevent fraud on the part of private corporations, to provide for the examination and control of loan and trust companies, and to regulate corporations operating in Iowa, regardless of where they were organized.[35] None of these bills passed, but they bear witness to a growing concern for government regulation of corporations. In the 1904 session of the legislature, House File 425 was introduced by H. B. Kling of Harrison County with the express purpose of providing for the regulation of organizations, other than loan and insurance companies, handling investments in Iowa. This bill became law, and although no great victory for the forces wishing to regulate corporations, it was a step in the right direction and heralded what was about to come.[36] In 1906 another attempt to regulate all corporations doing business in Iowa, whether organized there or not, was made, but with no success.[37]

[34] *Ibid., 1906*, Chaps. 71, 77; *1907*, Chaps. 85, 79; *House Journal, 1906*, H. F. 57.
[35] *Senate Journal, 1902*, S. F. 219, 311; *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 403.
[36] *House Journal, 1904*, H. F. 425; *Laws of Iowa, 1904*, Chap. 66.
[37] *House Journal, 1906*, H. F. 152.

As has been mentioned previously, the year 1907 seems to have produced a bumper crop of Progressive reform legislation. In that year a number of laws were passed dealing with corporations and their regulation. One of these laws prohibited the formation of combinations among grain elevator men or persons involved in grain dealing. Another put an end to the corporate abuse of "stock watering." Of supreme importance, however, was the passage of a law in 1907 which prohibited any corporation doing business within the state from giving financial or other aid to candidates in elections within the state.[38] This law was a severe blow to the railroads operating within Iowa, for they could no longer "buy" candidates and electors who would help to preserve their position through favorable legislation.

Two years later, in 1909, a law was enacted to require all corporations doing business within Iowa to make an annual report and pay an annual license fee to the secretary of state.[39] There was also an attempt in 1909 to regulate public utility corporations. A bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Herman Kull of Howard County to prohibit the formation of combinations, pools, and trusts; it became law and went one step further than the 1907 law concerning combinations in the grain dealing business and made combinations in any business illegal.[40]

Thus by 1910 corporations in Iowa had been prohibited from watering stock, required to make annual reports, required to be licensed, prohibited from combining and establishing trusts, and had been eliminated from influencing politics in any large degree with their wealth. With these successes the major goals of Iowa Progressivism as they applied to corporations within the state had been realized, and the heyday of corporate influence and power was over.

Although agitation for a primary law in Iowa dates back before the turn of the century, the early efforts for such a law gained more support in neighboring states than in Iowa. Wisconsin was the first Midwestern state

[38] *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chaps. 188, 73, 71. This last law required that all corporations doing business within the state of Iowa have their capital stock paid for in cash at par value.

[39] *Ibid., 1909*, Chap. 105.

[40] One bill, H. F. 178, was concerned with regulation of certain public service corporations, but was not passed; two years later, in 1911, the main concern of Iowa legislators in respect to corporations seemed to be centered about regulation of the ever increasing public service corporations. *Senate Journal, 1911*, S. F. 4, 42, 192; *House Journal*, 1909, H. F. 383; *Laws of Iowa, 1909*, Chap. 225.

to have such a primary election law. Still, Iowa did get a primary law and it proved to be one of Iowa Progressivism's greatest achievements.

As early as 1897 a desire existed among the people in Iowa for a law to regulate primary elections.[41] In the 1896 legislature several such bills had been introduced but had failed to pass. In 1898, when the Twenty-seventh General Assembly met, several more efforts were made to get a primary election bill passed. Two of these bills failed, but a third passed and became Iowa's first law allowing primary elections to be held.[42] Under this law any party in any county could adopt the primary election system, but the law was not compulsory nor was it statewide.

Four years later the first compulsory statewide primary law was proposed by Senator James J. Crossley of Winterset. The same measure was introduced in the House by Robert A. Greene of Madison County and was lost there by a vote of 48 to 51.[43] Sentiment favoring a statewide primary served to let legislators know of the widespread and increasing interest in such a law, and between adjournment of the 1902 session and the convening of the legislature in 1904 much discussion was devoted to the subject. In the minds of many, citizens and legislators alike, the time had come to do something about the existing situation.[44] When the session of the Thirtieth General Assembly met in 1904, five primary bills were introduced, but again, only one of these passed — a bill introduced by Emory H. English requiring primary elections in those counties with a population of 75,000 or more.[45] By 1906 feeling concerning a statewide primary still ran high, and the subject was discussed by newspaper editors and the citizenry in general. Comments, pro and con, appeared on the pages of newspapers throughout the state. "The best argument for a primary law in this state," in the opinion of a Knoxville editor, "is the opposition of the railroad attorneys to such a measure." The Dubuque *Times* did not think such a law necessary:

[41] English, "Evolution in Iowa Voting Practices," 261.

[42] *Senate Journal, 1896*, S. F. 29; *1898*, S. F. 20, 123; *House Journal, 1896*, H. F. 66, 45; *1898*, H. F. 150. House File 150 was the bill which became law. *Laws of Iowa, 1898*, Chap. 111.

[43] *Senate Journal, 1902*, S. F. 2; *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 8.

[44] English, "Evolution in Iowa Voting Practices," 264-8.

[45] *Senate Journal, 1904*, S. F. 3, 147; *House Journal*, 1904, H. F. 1, 3, 22; *Laws of Iowa, 1904*, Chap. 40. House File 1 was the English bill; at the time of its passage it required primary elections only in Polk County, since it was the only county covered by the population requirement.

> A statewide primary law for Iowa is about as necessary as a fifth wheel to a wagon. It is one thing to throw the protection of the law about primaries, caucuses or conventions called by proper authority within the party. It is quite another to limit the people to a certain form in making nominations for public office and to impose on the taxpayers the cost of contests between the politicians for the nominations. No public necessity requires this course and the experience of no state which has tried the primary plan demonstrates that public advantage results from it.[46]

Planks in the party platforms indicate that both the Republican and Democratic parties favored the primary in 1906.[47] As a result, Representatives Robert A. Greene and Emory H. English, who had both introduced primary bills in the 1904 legislature, proposed bills for statewide primaries in 1906, as did Representative J. C. Flenniken of Clayton County.[48] Still, none of these bills passed in 1906. Early in the 1907 session, two bills for primary elections were introduced in the Senate, one by Senator Peterson of Clarion and one by Senator Crossley of Winterset. After much discussion and amendment, a bill substituted by the Committee on Elections, but resembling the Crossley bill closely, passed the Senate by a vote of 46 to 2. In the House the bill underwent further discussion and amendment, but was finally passed by a unanimous vote. The struggle to get a primary law for Iowa was not over yet, however, for the Senate refused to concur in the House amendments, and a conference committee had to be appointed. The committee's report was adopted by both houses on March 29, 1907, and the bill was sent to the governor and signed into law.[49] Thus, after more than ten years of struggle, Iowa had a statewide primary election law which allowed the people to nominate candidates directly for public office. The law also provided for a preferential vote for a party candidate for United States Senator.

In addition to the feeling that the primary election was a needed reform,

[46] Knoxville *Journal* and Dubuque *Times*, quoted in Sioux City *Journal*, Jan. 17, 1906.

[47] English, "Evolution in Iowa Voting Practices," 278.

[48] *House Journal, 1906*, H. F. 7, 153, 372.

[49] *Senate Journal, 1907*, S. F. 2, 3, 280, and pp. 923, 1015, 1120-21, 1153, 1285; *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 51. Section 25 outlawed the use of proxy delegates at nominating conventions, a practice which had been frequently used to control conventions.

considerable sentiment was voiced by Iowa Progressives, particularly from 1907 on, for popular election of United States Senators. The Waterloo *Courier* expressed early in 1907 the feeling of most Progressives of Iowa and the nation as a whole:

> Government will never be made sufficiently responsive to public opinion until United States senators come to be elected by direct vote. An amendment to the Constitution requiring the election of senators by direct vote is one of the crying needs of the times, and it is gratifying to note the sentiment favorable to such an amendment is all the while growing. . . . If senators were elected by direct vote parties would give more care of the selection of candidates. Corporations would be less likely to control elections, for, if a party should fly in the face of public sentiment and select an unfit candidate, the people could provide the needed remedy at the polls; whereas now, once a nomination is made in party caucus, however unfit it may be, the party whip is invoked to confirm the caucus nomination by an election in the legislature.[50]

So eminent a person as Senator Jonathan P. Dolliver commented on the subject, although in language not nearly as emphatic as the Waterloo editor's:

> While I fully recognize the propriety of bringing the office of senator within the direct control of the people by including it in the provisions of the primary law to the enactment of which all parties in Iowa are committed, nevertheless, I cannot forbear saying that in this state the old system has worked well. . . .
>
> The idea of the [founding] fathers was that the people should choose the senator. In the simplicity of their hearts they never foresaw that in many states the time would come when candidates for the senate would choose the legislature, either by the power of the machine or, as just now in Colorado, by financing the nomination and election of its members, leaving that body to merely enter upon its records the secret proceedings of the campaign. In the state of Iowa from its admission to the Union — from Grimes to Allison — that greatest and best beloved man in the history of the state, the people have chosen the legislature and the legislature has selected the senator. We can do no harm and may do much good to shift the contest for senatorial succession from the state house to the townships, so that dangerous tendencies already mani-

[50] Waterloo *Daily Courier*, Jan. 21, 1907.

> fest in many places to make the business of the state, growing every year more important and more complex, altogether subordinate to the intrigues which are likely to attend the election of senators of the United States, may be corrected.[51]

Starting with the Thirty-first General Assembly, which met in 1906, joint resolutions advocating the direct election of United States Senators were made with considerable regularity. The preferential vote provided for in the 1907 primary law was an effort to give the people a voice in the election of a Senator. Finally, in 1913, passage and ratification of the Seventeenth Amendment to the United States Constitution resolved the matter.[52]

Other changes in election laws which came about during the first fifteen years of the twentieth century were: those providing for biennial elections; a law requiring candidates in elections in Iowa, whether primary, municipal, or general, to file statements showing their expenses in the election; and a statute providing for the registration of voters in cities and counties of certain population. In addition to these actual legislated changes, bills were introduced but not passed dealing with various aspects of elections, ranging from a bill in 1904 to regulate the right of suffrage and the right to vote, to a couple of bills introduced in 1913 which would have provided for an absentee ballot.[53]

Efforts to enact pure food and drug laws date back to the early days of the Progressive era in Iowa politics. Efforts to curb the adulteration of foods and drugs by the unscrupulous were carried on by courageous men on both the national and state level. Although such laws passed sooner on the national level, efforts to obtain such legislation in Iowa were brought to a successful culmination close upon the heels of the federal legislation.[54] In the session of the Twenty-ninth General Assembly, which met in 1902, two bills aimed at curbing misbranding and adulteration of foods failed to pass, but they indicated the enlarging interest in the matter of the misuse of

[51] Speech before Republican caucus, Des Moines, Jan. 22, 1907, in *ibid.*, Jan. 23, 1907.

[52] *Laws of Iowa, 1906*, Joint Res. 3; *1907*, Senate Joint Res. 2; *1913*, Chap. 105.

[53] *Ibid., 1904*, Joint Res. 1; *1906*, Chap. 41; *1907*, Chap. 50; Amendment to Sec. 16, Art. 12, Iowa Constitution, *House Journal, 1904*, H. F. 97; *1913*, H. F. 251; *Senate Journal, 1913*, S. F. 468.

[54] The federal Pure Food and Drug Act and the Meat Inspection Act were passed in 1906; Iowa's pure food and drug legislation came in 1906 and 1907.

brands and the contamination of food sold to the public. When the Thirtieth General Assembly met in 1904, three more bills concerned with purity of foods and drugs dispensed to the public failed.[55] Early in the next session, two years later, Senator Byron W. Newberry introduced a bill "to prevent the adulteration, misbranding and imitation of foods, to change the office of 'State Dairy Commissioner' to that of 'State Food and Dairy Commissioner' and to define his duties." A substitute for this bill, but resembling its provisions very closely, was finally adopted and sent to the governor for signature on February 23, 1906.[56] By its passage a situation where hundreds in the state died from ptomaine poisoning or from effects traceable to food contamination was practically eliminated.

A bill relating to regulation of the manufacture and purity of patent medicines was introduced in 1906, but it did not pass. However, the following year, when the legislature met under the new biennial election amendment, such a bill, introduced by Senator Newberry, passed and was signed into law.[57] The consequences of the law are suggested by an article written at the time the bill was being discussed in the Senate:

> The storm is gathering about the heads of the courageous statesmen who have fathered the bill to put a curb on the dangers of the patent medicine business.
>
> The bill, upon close examination, is found to be decidedly drastic in its provisions. It goes so deep that it will, if enforced, put out of business a good many of the bottled concoctions which are sold everywhere in the state. . . . It would virtually drive out of business a number of the big institutions in Des Moines, but the members point to the good that would come from such a law.[58]

Nonetheless, Iowa now had both a pure food law and a pure drug law, and a decided victory had been won by the forces behind Iowa's Progressive sentiment.[59]

Another area where change was sought by Iowa's Progressives was edu-

[55] *Senate Journal, 1902*, S. F. 306; *1904*, S. F. 273; *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 146; *1904*, H. F. 187, 218. House File 217 and Senate File 273 were aimed at regulating the sale of patent medicines containing narcotics or any alcoholic preparation.

[56] *Senate Journal, 1906*, S. F. 8, and pp. 338-9, 410, 485; *Laws of Iowa, 1906*, Chap. 166.

[57] *Senate Journal, 1906*, S. F. 148; *1907*, S. F. 31; *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 176.

[58] Waterloo *Daily Courier*, Jan. 31, 1907.

[59] *Laws of Iowa, 1906*, Chap. 166; *1907*, Chap. 176.

cation. The demands can be summarized as basically these: (1) improvement and enlargement of the facilities at the three state institutions of higher learning; (2) a compulsory education law; and (3) codification of Iowa's school laws. This last demand came later in the movement than the first two.

The problem of securing increased funds needed by the three state schools is one that confronted legislators before 1900 and it has never ceased to exist in urgent form. Therefore, it is of no particular credit to Progressivism that it recognized and did something about these demands. However, some special things done at this time can be credited to Progressivism. The best example is the 1909 law which created a State Board of Education which was given control over the three state schools — the University at Iowa City, the Agricultural College at Ames, and the Teachers College at Cedar Falls.[60] The Thirty-fourth General Assembly in 1911 extended the powers of the Board somewhat. The fixing of a definite control and responsibility over these three schools was a considerable reform in view of previous methods of controlling the policies and operation of the schools. Another item of important legislation became reality in 1913 when the Thirty-fifth General Assembly passed a law establishing the Department of Public Instruction which was to have jurisdiction over the rural, elementary, and high schools of the state.[61]

A big demand during the early days of the Progressive era in Iowa politics was concerned with a compulsory school law which would require parents to send their children to school until a certain level of achievement or a certain age had been reached. Demands for such a law were met in 1902 when the Twenty-ninth General Assembly passed a law which required parents to send their children to school if between the ages of seven and fourteen years.[62] Under this law children were to be in school for a period of twelve consecutive weeks of each school year. The law was rather weak in that it did not apply to children who lived more than two miles from any school by the nearest traveled road, unless transportation at

[60] *Ibid., 1909,* Chap. 170.

[61] *Ibid., 1911,* Chap. 132; *1913,* Chap. 103.

[62] *Ibid., 1902,* Chap. 128. The main provisions of the law required that parents of children mentally and physically able, between the ages of seven and fourteen years, were duty-bound to send such children to school, either public, private, or parochial, or should hire a tutor.

public expense were provided. Also, violation of the law constituted only a misdemeanor with a fine ranging from three to twenty dollars for conviction per offense. Still, it was a compulsory school law, and with improvements through the years it became quite effective in fulfilling its intended purpose. In 1904 the law was amended to read "sixteen consecutive weeks" of school rather than twelve; also, the sixteen weeks were to commence after the first of September unless local school boards decided on a later date, but not later than December 5.[63] Nothing further was done in connection with compulsory education until 1913 when Senator Frederic Larrabee introduced a bill to change the age at which children would be required to attend public school.[64] Under the provision of this amendment to the Code, all children between the ages of seven and sixteen years were required to attend school; the alternative was to have attained educational qualifications equal to those of pupils who have completed the eighth grade. The 1902 law with its 1913 amendment remains on the statute books to the present, a testimony to the thoroughness of Progressivism's workers.

Some agitation for revision and codification of the school laws had started during Governor Cummins' administration, and in 1907 a law was passed to create a commission to look into the matter.[65] However, nothing of great value was done, and the demand for codification of the school laws continued.

In 1913 several significant bills relating to the teaching profession were enacted into law. One of these required teachers to have at least twelve weeks of teacher training in order to be certified. The law was to go into effect July 1, 1915. Another law required teacher institutes to be held at least once annually, preferably on the county level. Still another bill provided for the election of county superintendents of schools.[66]

Twentieth century Progressivism was also concerned with another aspect of the treatment and rights of children — that of child labor. Many con-

[63] *Ibid., 1904*, Chap. 116.

[64] *Senate Journal, 1913*, S. F. 79; *Laws of Iowa, 1913*, Chap. 255.

[65] *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 222.

[66] *Ibid., 1913*, Chaps. 243, 225, 107. Under the provisions of the latter law, the primary duty of the county superintendent was to visit the schools of the county at least once a year and more often, if necessary. Irving H. Hart, "The Governors of Iowa as Educational Leaders, 1838 to 1949," IOWA JOURNAL OF HISTORY, 54:250-55 (July, 1956), presents a summary of legislation dealing with education under Governors Cummins, Garst, and Clarke.

sidered the early employment of growing children a great abuse. An indication of the feeling of the times is given by statements taken from the pages of an Iowa newspaper the same year that Iowa received its first real child labor law:

> Strange as it may seem, the statute books of Iowa contain practically no legislation on this subject [child labor]. The only laws we have are one prohibiting the employment of boys under twelve in coal mines, and another prohibiting the employment of children under sixteen around dangerous machinery.
>
> The enactment of proper laws will work hardship in some cases, where really needy parents require the assistance of children to enable the family to get along. But it is better that the public support such needy families during the childhood of the boys and girls than that whole families should be pauperized in the future through the abuse of children now growing up. We hope the present legislature may enact a proper child labor law.[67]

Two bills aimed at better regulation of the employment of children had been introduced in the Senate during the 1902 legislature, but neither had passed.[68] Two years later Cassius C. Dowell in the Senate and B. F. Cummings of Marshall County in the House introduced similar bills to regulate the employment of child labor. Again, both bills failed.[69] When the legislature met in 1906, William S. Hart of Allamakee County introduced a bill in the House which was similar to the Dowell bill of two years earlier. The Committee on Judiciary suggested a substitute, which passed both houses and became law. Provisions of this law required that no person under fourteen years of age could be employed in any mine, factory, mill, shop, or laundry, where more than eight persons were employed; no person under sixteen years of age was to be employed at any job which might injure his health and morals; girls under sixteen were not to be employed at any work which required constant standing. Those under fourteen years of age were not to be employed prior to 6:00 A. M. nor after 9:00 P. M. The penalty for violation of this act was a fine not to exceed $100 or imprisonment for thirty days, and the enforcing agency was to be the Commissioner of Labor Statistics.[70]

[67] Harlan *Shelby County Republican*, Feb. 8, 1906.
[68] *Senate Journal, 1902*, S. F. 3, 229.
[69] *Ibid., 1904*, S. F. 56; *House Journal, 1904*, H. F. 43.
[70] *House Journal, 1906*, H. F. 74; *Laws of Iowa, 1906*, Chap. 103.

The passage of this law was undoubtedly Progressivism's greatest triumph in the area of child labor legislation in Iowa, but two other items of legislation perhaps deserve mention here also. The first of these was a law passed in 1909 which provided that any officer whose duty it was to enforce the provisions of the child labor law of 1906 could demand proof of employers of the age of any child employed in their establishments.[71] If such proof could not be given, the child in question would be dismissed from employment. This amendment to the original law gave enforcing agencies more authority in carrying out their duties. The second item of note came in 1913 and was a bill to establish a bureau of women and children within the Bureau of Labor to carry on the work necessary in regulating the employment of women and children.[72] The bill did not pass, but it indicated a recognition and concern with a matter deserving of some attention and reform.

In the area of penal reform, Iowa Progressives sought to carry into action the suggestions of Governor Cummins. At the very outset, in 1902, bills were introduced to establish an industrial reformatory for women, but all failed to receive enough support for passage.[73] Two years later, in the Thirtieth General Assembly, Senator Warren Garst introduced a bill to provide for indeterminate sentences and to authorize the Board of Control of State Institutions to adopt and enforce rules for paroling. Although the bill passed in the Senate, it failed to receive a majority in the House. Garst also introduced a measure in the 1904 legislature to establish a reformatory for men, but this bill also failed.[74] D. C. Mott of Audubon County introduced a bill in the House which was radical for its time, for it sought to establish a juvenile court to regulate the treatment and control of dependent, neglected, and delinquent children. Not until 1915 was such a proposal enacted into law.[75]

The 1906 session of the Iowa legislature dealt with another group of bills concerned with the indeterminate sentence and the establishment of reformatories, but none of them mustered enough support for passage. Once more

[71] *Laws of Iowa, 1909*, Chap. 145.

[72] *House Journal, 1913*, H. F. 117.

[73] *Senate Journal, 1902*, S. F. 130; *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 21, 196.

[74] *Senate Journal, 1904*, S. F. 4, 5.

[75] *House Journal, 1904*, H. F. 397; *Supplement to Code of Iowa, 1915*, Sections 254-a15, 254-a16.

the year 1907 proved to be the year of fruition for penal reform legislation, and after a considerable struggle getting the bill passed, a law concerning the indeterminate sentence and a system of reform and parole of criminals was entered in the Code of Iowa.[76] Little more of real significance happened in the way of penal reform legislation during the time that Progressivism was riding high in Iowa.

Another significant accomplishment of Iowa Progressives was the enactment into law of provision for cities having a population of 25,000 or over to adopt the commission plan of city government.[77] This plan, commonly referred to as the "Des Moines Plan," had been adopted in the state capital the year before and seemed to be a successful way of controlling the problems of machine politics, inefficiency, and incompetency in large city administrations.

In respect to taxation, bills were introduced in every session of the Iowa legislature from 1902 to 1909 dealing with either the collection of delinquent taxes or the assessment of taxes. Two of these, each dealing with the collection of delinquent taxes, were successfully enacted into law. Undoubtedly the greatest victory in the area of taxation was achieved in 1911 with the passage of a law to establish a Tax Commission.[78] As a result of this law the powers and duties of the Executive Council with respect to taxation were shifted to this Commission, thus making for a more efficiently organized arrangement in connection with taxation matters in the state.

Efforts to amend the Iowa Constitution to allow women the right to vote had been espoused since the close of the Civil War, but resolutions and bills to that effect were either indefinitely postponed or lost by substantial majorities in the General Assembly, except for one resolution passed by the Senate in 1902 but lost in the House.[79] Woman suffrage legislation had to wait, on both the state and national level, for the close of World War I and the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

[76] *Senate Journal, 1906*, S. F. 240; *1907*, S. F. 30; *House Journal, 1906*, H. F. 95, 266, 343; *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 192.

[77] *Senate Journal, 1907*, S. F. 212; *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 48.

[78] *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 429; *1906*, H. F. 73; *1907*, H. F. 370; *1909*, H. F. 96; *Senate Journal, 1904*, S. F. 216; *1906*, S. F. 60; *1907*, S. F. 67; *Laws of Iowa, 1906*, Chap. 53; *1909*, Chap. 89; *1911*, Chap. 204.

[79] J. Van Der Zee, "Proposed Constitutional Amendments in Iowa, 1857-1909," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, 8:192-7 (April, 1910); *Senate Journal, 1902*, pp. 134, 269, 403.

Similarly, attempts were made from 1874 onward to amend the state Constitution so as to provide for the initiative and referendum, but with little success. Bills introduced in both 1904 and 1906 failed to pass.[80] Here, unlike the situation involving woman suffrage, the failure was so complete that the people of the state still are unable to initiate laws themselves, nor is legislation referred to them except in the case of some special money bills or amendments to the state constitution.

The problem of inebriates and methods of their detention came in for some airing during the Progressive era. In 1902 a law had been passed providing for the detention of inebriates at the hospital for the insane, but this was not a fit place for the detention of such individuals, and the feeling was that a state hospital for such people ought to be established. In 1904 legislation to that end was enacted, providing a state hospital for "dipsomaniacs, inebriates, and for those addicted to the excessive use of narcotics."[81] The hospital was to be at Knoxville, and a qualified doctor was to be head of it.

Another problem was concerned with desertion and nonsupport. Bills dealing with this subject were introduced in every session of the legislature from 1902 until 1907, when a law was finally enacted which defined desertion, provided punishment for it, and permitted a husband or wife to be a witness in such cases.[82]

A little of what might be termed labor legislation was enacted in Iowa during the Progressive period, but it was nothing really very radical for its day. As early as 1902, a bill introduced by Fred L. Maytag in the Senate, providing for the safety and comfort of factory workers, became law.[83] In 1904 a bill limited the hours of work of street car workers as a measure to safeguard the riding public.[84] By 1906 some Progressives were thinking about and proposing the establishment of state employment offices.[85] In 1907 bills to safeguard the traveling public by limiting the hours of work

[80] *Senate Journal, 1904*, pp. 910, 961; *House Journal, 1904*, pp. 1022-24, 1121; *1906*, pp. 126, 219; Van Der Zee, "Proposed Constitutional Amendments in Iowa," 197-9.

[81] *Laws of Iowa, 1902*, Chap. 93; *1904*, Chap. 80.

[82] *Senate Journal, 1902*, S. F. 80; *1904*, S. F. 72; *1906*, S. F. 41; *1907*, S. F. 5; *House Journal, 1902*, H. F. 99; *1904*, H. F. 121; *1907*, H. F. 373; *Laws of Iowa, 1907*, Chap. 170.

[83] *Senate Journal, 1902*, S. F. 212; *Laws of Iowa, 1902*, Chap. 149.

[84] *House Journal, 1904*, H. F. 298.

[85] *Senate Journal, 1906*, S. F. 176; *House Journal, 1906*, H. F. 241.

of railroad workers were introduced.[86] Concern with what has become known as "workmen's compensation laws" was not evident in any degree until the Thirty-fifth General Assembly met in 1913, and in that particular session several bills were introduced with that as their express purpose. Although none of them was enacted into law, they indicate the increasing concern for such laws.[87]

In the area of liquor laws and enforcement, considerable legislation passed during the period from 1900 to 1915. Beginning in 1904 a law defined a "bootlegger" and prescribed punishment for this crime. An important liquor measure, passed in 1907, prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquor to minors or persons intoxicated or habitually intoxicated. In 1909 a law required that town councils issue permits to sell liquor in any given place to only a limited number of people. Because there was still much violation of the liquor laws of the state, a 1911 law increased the penalty for such violation. Two items of liquor legislation in 1913 dealt with the hours that saloons could be open for business and prohibited the sale of liquor within a five-mile radius of any state educational institution.[88]

Although Progressives advocated the establishment of a direct inheritance tax, nothing was done in Iowa in respect to this matter during the Progressive era. Numerous bills were introduced and passed relating to the collection of the collateral inheritance tax, but no direct inheritance tax bills seem ever to have been introduced in the Iowa legislature during this period.[89]

A matter which elicited more concern was the problem of the lobbyist. Governor Cummins denounced the lobbyists in rather strong language in his inaugural address of 1902, and the public was also becoming more and more concerned. A Cedar Rapids editor, in 1907, expressed the growing feeling on the part of the public: "The thing of prime importance is, of course, to get rid of the lobbyist. He has no business on the floor of the house. The representative of any interest may have the opportunity of appearing before committees and stating his case, but he should not be per-

[86] *House Journal, 1907*, H. F. 65, 210, 56.

[87] *Ibid., 1913*, H. F. 281, 301; *Senate Journal, 1913*, S. F. 290.

[88] *Laws of Iowa, 1904*, Chap. 84; *1907*, Chap. 122; *1909*, Chap. 142; *1911*, Chap. 102; *1913*, Chaps. 193, 194.

[89] See *House Journals, Senate Journals*, and *Laws of Iowa*, 1900-1913.

mitted to pester the members when the house is in session."[90] Unfortunately, the Governor's admonition and public opinion seemed not enough, for although bills were introduced in 1907 and 1911, nothing in the way of concrete legislation followed.[91]

The Progressive legislatures did not pass laws on all subjects needing reform, but the amount and character of legislation enacted was considerable. Viewed in the light of modern-day experience, the "fruits" of Progressivism in Iowa would be nothing to become concerned or alarmed about, even by the most conservative politician of today, for the reforms enacted are now commonplace and taken for granted by most citizens. Yet, judged by the standards of the day when they were enacted, these reforms were definitely liberal, and in some instances, even radical. In a day when corporate influence and wealth wielded great power and ignored the sovereignty of the people over them, it was not only radical but actually daring and courageous to protest and seek to act to limit and change this situation.

Progressivism "was in spirit and purpose a protest against organized selfishness,"[92] which manifested itself in the gobbling up of political power and wealth with no regard for the people, who in reality made it possible for these forces to exist in the first place. Progressivism was a vigorous movement, with a definite purpose, but it was up against equally vigorous forces that were fighting to preserve the status quo with as much conviction and fervor as the forces of Progressivism held for reform and change. However, Progressivism was also a popular state of mind — a public sentiment for change and reform — and as it grew in strength, the forces of conservatism aligned against it found that they could not withstand it in all quarters, and reforms were obtained.

By 1915 this Progressive impulse had been satisfied to some degree and was also being replaced in Iowa, as well as in the rest of the nation, by a growing concern and interest in the war in Europe. With America's entrance into the war, the Progressive sentiment became dormant, to be revived again in the 1930's, at which time its leaders and spokesmen came chiefly from within the Democratic party.

The significant thing, it would seem, is what Progressivism in Iowa ac-

[90] Cedar Rapids *Gazette*, quoted in Waterloo *Daily Courier*, Jan. 24, 1907.

[91] *House Journal, 1907*, H. F. 25; *1911*, H. F. 557.

[92] Spirit Lake *Beacon*, Mar. 9, 1906.

complished and how lasting its accomplishments have been. Most of the legislation enacted in Iowa during the Progressive era, 1900 to 1915, still remains on the statute books of the state. Many of the laws remain as their authors wrote them, and others remain but in an amended form — usually amended so as to secure greater reforms. Also, many of the reforms which Progressivism failed to bring to fruition have since become law.

Judged by what it actually accomplished, directly or indirectly, Progressivism would seem undeniably to have been a success in Iowa. The people of Iowa were free from the domination of their government by corporate influence; they were given the power to choose candidates through the operation of a primary election law; their schools, under an improved educational system, made Iowa one of the most literate states in the Union; their children's health and morals were protected by child labor laws; their penal system became superior to that which existed before 1900; they were guaranteed that foods and drugs sold within the state would not be adulterated or poisonous; they were given compensation when unemployed and assistance in their old age; and they were free of other manifestations of the "organized selfishness" which had become so intolerable near the turn of the century.