

INAUGURAL ADDRESS
OF
HORACE BOIES,

GOVERNOR OF IOWA,

DELIVERED

AT HIS INAUGURATION,

FEBRUARY 27, 1890.

PRINTED BY AUTHORITY OF LAW.

DES MOINES:
G. H. RAGSDALE, STATE PRINTER
1890.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

FELLOW-CITIZENS, GENTLEMEN OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—The circumstances under which I was elected to the office of Chief Magistrate of my state naturally impress me with an unusual weight of responsibility.

I am not at liberty to regard my election as a purely partisan victory. I recognize the fact that my position is due to the united action of men of different political parties, and assume the duties of the high office to which I have been called, conscious that the people of my state have a right to expect at my hands an administration of their affairs as broad and as liberal as the spirit they have manifested towards me.

Profoundly grateful as I am for the honor so generously bestowed, I will have greater reason still for gratitude if at the end of my term I can feel that no act of mine has weakened the faith or betrayed the confidence of those who have trusted me. As I accept from their hands the symbol of power, and assume the duties it brings, I devoutly pray for wisdom which shall enable me to so perform the great work to which I am called that no hour of my life will be pained with the reflection that I have proved unequal to, or unworthy of, the task assigned me.

The legislature will have for its aid the message of our retiring Governor, whose long and faithful service in the office he has so highly honored and whose thorough familiarity with the wants of the state will entitle his suggestions to most careful consideration and relieve me from obligation to discuss many of the subjects to which he has so ably referred.

Since, however, the executive of the state is necessarily a co-ordinate branch of the law-making power, I will be permitted to suggest that it is more important that her statutes be wise than it is that they be numerous.

It is, in the judgment of many, a misfortune rather than a blessing that we have so many statutory regulations. They believe that

too much virtue is ascribed to such enactments and too little to those unwritten laws which, having their source in the very fountains of natural right, pervade all countries and in many instances define, better than statutes can do, the obligations and privileges of men.

I do not wish to suggest that the duties of legislators are light. No greater responsibility is imposed upon man. Upon their wisdom, sagacity, and sense of justice depends the welfare of those for whom they legislate.

If they act wisely, they may build for themselves a monument of fame crowned with the blessings of those they serve. If they fail, they must walk in the shadows of the misfortunes their own hands have wrought.

Important public questions agitate our people; some are of local application, others involve the nation of which we are a part.

BALLOT REFORM.

Among these is the question of ballot reform. The safety of a republic necessarily depends upon the intelligence of its electors and the faithful discharge by them of their duties at the polls.

Ignorance, as well as corruption, is incompatible with stability in a government that derives its powers from the people. If any danger threatens the perpetuity of this government, it lies in the fact that, ignoring the question of intelligence, the elective franchise has been extended beyond the limits of reasonable safety.

Our own constitution fixes the distinction between those who are and those who are not entitled to this privilege at the point where the lowest order of rational intelligence in male citizens twenty-one years of age touches the boundary line of helpless idiocy or maniacal delusion.

In localities where the masses are as intelligent as the people of Iowa, even this liberality is not beset with imminent danger, but it forces upon thoughtful minds the necessity for unceasing care in guarding the purity of a franchise that shapes with an iron hand the destiny of our state.

The duty of the elector is plain: by the most sacred of human obligations he is bound to bring to the aid of the government of which he is a member the weight of his unbiased intelligence upon every political issue his vote helps to determine. And yet in countless ways the state is deprived of that which so justly belongs to it. Men go to the polls and deposit their votes in blind obedi-

ence to party ties they will not sunder. The empty name of a political organization is too often the embodiment of their faith; and they follow it, unmindful of constantly changing issues which demand impartial consideration. Self-constituted overseers pursue those who stop to consult their conscience or exercise their reason in the discharge of one of the most important of duties. The strong overcome the weak, employers too often control employes, the rich direct the poor, and all of these rob in a degree the nation and the state of that upon which their safety depends—the deliberate judgment of those who exercise the almost sacred privilege of the elective franchise.

If we could stop here in the enumeration of dangers which flow from a faithless ballot, the situation would not call so loudly for safeguards around the polls.

It is a humiliating fact, and yet one that it is criminal negligence to ignore, that some men are corrupt enough to buy, and others base enough to sell, the noblest birthright of an American citizen.

No duty is more plain than that which demands of the legislative department of every government the enactment of laws which shall to the utmost limit of utility surround the ballot-box with safeguards that will banish from all elections the corrupt use of money and secure to the state the unbiased judgment of each elector. This can, as I believe, be most effectually accomplished through statutes which compel the deposit of a secret ballot, the contents of which can never be made known except by him who deposits it, and then without evidence to corroborate his statement. Such laws put it beyond the power of others to criticize the elector's ballot who desires to keep it secret, and compels those disposed to use money corruptly to rely upon the uncorroborated word of men base enough to sell their votes.

RAILROADS.

Great interest naturally attaches to the subject of rates for railway transportation. In the present depressed condition of prices it is natural that those whose pecuniary interests are affected thereby should demand that these be fixed at the lowest possible point attainable without actual injustice to the carrier.

Prior to our present laws on this subject the purchaser of transportation was at the mercy of railway companies. Their uncontrolled will, however arbitrarily exercised, was a final decree from which there was no appeal and for which there was no redress.

Their managers were mortals only. They abused their power, as nearly all men do whose pecuniary interests control their sense of right and wrong.

They were not satisfied with remunerative dividends upon the money actually invested in the great enterprise over which they presided, but they watered the stock of their corporations, sold it at prices far below its face value, and then undertook to conduct business on a basis that would return dividends on these imaginary investments. To accomplish this, individual and public rights alike were often sacrificed. Odious discrimination was repeatedly practiced. Towns and cities in one part of the state were favored at the expense of those in other localities, wherever this would operate to the advantage of the railway companies.

The situation compelled submission to existing evils or the adoption of a system which would practically reverse former conditions, and put the control of terms upon which business should be transacted with these companies into the hands of officers selected by the public.

It was a dangerous power that railway managers wielded when they controlled the situation, and they abused it. Unless judiciously exercised, it might easily become a dangerous power the people have assumed, and care should be taken that no man can justly charge that they have abused it.

It is no wrong to the railway interests of this state that our people desire. They only demand that their own interests shall be fairly treated.

No one overlooks the fact that it is to the railroads we are indebted for the wonderful development of our state or fails to realize that any cause which should cripple them would necessarily react upon great business interests the wants of which they alone can supply. We would never be satisfied with anything less than the most efficient of railway service; this can be furnished by none but first-class roads, substantially built, thoroughly equipped and operated by competent employes.

Upon the perfection of these roads and their equipment, and the skill and care of those who operate them, more than money depends. The lives of a multitude of passengers are constantly confided to their keeping. An army of employes braves the dangers of a business always hazardous, and doubly so on inferior roads.

We cannot go too far in demanding safeguards against accidents on railways. It is a terrible charge, often made, that the danger

to life and limb in a business upon which our comfort and prosperity so largely depend is greater than that of soldiers in active service in times of war.

The yearly record of the maimed and dead among those engaged in the operation of railroads is appalling indeed.

It was a worthy tribute to a deserving class when the chief magistrate of this nation called attention to the sufferings of these men and invoked the aid of national law to lessen their dangers.

The better instincts of human nature everywhere will respond to that call, but with it must go a liberality toward the companies that will enable them to pay reasonable dividends on the capital actually invested in their business, supply the best of human devices for the protection of passengers and employes, and pay wages adequate to compensate skilled and faithful workmen; and then they should be required to perform their whole duty to the public. It is no easy task to discover the line of even and exact justice between our people and the railway corporations doing business within this state, but it is not impracticable; and if those who address themselves to this great problem succeed in harmonizing their apparently conflicting, but in fact mutually dependent, interests so that the work of developing the resources of our state shall have the united aid of prosperous business enterprises on all sides, they will receive, as they will deserve, the approbation of just men everywhere.

It is greater facilities for transportation that Iowa most needs. She should help hasten the day when the waters of our great lakes will be turned from their course and made to mingle with those of the mighty rivers that clasp her in their giant arms.

I would not yield for a moment the just prerogative of the state to exercise in the interest of the public a most careful supervision over every mode of transportation within its jurisdiction, but beyond this, in my own judgment, lies a still broader field of duty, a more important work to the people of the great Northwest, of which Iowa is a central figure, if not the imperial head.

Already, in the very infancy of its existence, this section surpasses all others of equal extent in the magnitude of its surplus food productions.

Deprived of reasonable rates of transportation, they are of little value to those whose capital and labor produce them, and without them the commerce of this nation would be largely crippled and many of its great cities would cease to expand, if they did not dwindle into decay.

Who shall grasp this difficult problem and solve it in the interest of all our people? Not he who trusts to the ingenuity of man alone. Not those, I believe, who rely upon law to regulate rates upon a single mode of conveyance that must depend upon private capital, voluntarily invested for its maintenance, but it will be the men who set this nation to work to complete the connecting link of a mighty waterway that shall cut a continent in twain, and open the cheapest of all methods of transportation from the gulf to the sea.

NECESSITY FOR REDISTRICTING THE STATE.

The constitution of our state provides that the legislature at each regular session thereof shall fix the ratio of representation, and form into representative districts those counties which are not entitled singly to a representative, so as to apportion the members of the legislature among the several counties and representative districts according to the number of inhabitants therein.

The census of 1885, upon which the present ratio of representation was established, showed the population of the state to be in round numbers 1,754,000, which should have made the actual ratio for 100 members 17,540.

Instead of adopting this number, the legislature in 1886 enacted that 24,000 should be the ratio of representation, and thereupon proceeded to divide the state into assembly districts. The constitution also provides that any county or district having one-half the number of inhabitants fixed as the ratio of representation shall be entitled to one member, and any county having one-half more than that number shall be entitled to two. No less than sixteen of the districts as then formed contained less than 12,000 inhabitants. Some having but one member had more than 35,000. The last general assembly re-enacted this apportionment and division without change.

I cannot help believing a great error was committed both in the apportionment and division of the state so made. To justify an apportionment upon a basis of 24,000 to a district required a population of 2,400,000 inhabitants. This was more than 600,000 in excess of our actual population. In dividing the state into districts this error grew into an actual wrong. So far as the sixteen districts containing less than half the population fixed by the ratio of representation are concerned, their establishment, in the judgment of many of our people, was a violation of the fundamental law of the state, while the inhabitants of those containing the

greater number are certainly deprived of a fair and equal representation in the legislature.

No one can rightfully maintain that one person in one part of the state is entitled to the same representation in the legislature that is accorded to four in other localities, and yet the difference is even greater than this between some of the districts.

Without reference to party affiliations, we cannot too stoutly maintain the necessity for unqualified obedience to the constitution of our state and impartial recognition of the political rights of every one of her citizens. It will be the duty of the present legislature to establish a new ratio of representation and re-district the state. This will undoubtedly be so done as to avoid just criticism in the future.

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS.

There is much in the common school system of our state of which to boast, and little, perhaps, can be done in the way of legislation to improve its condition.

This, I regret to say, is not the situation of our higher institutions of learning. If they are made to compare favorably with those of sister states, large sums of money must be contributed for their establishment and support.

In 1846 two townships of land were set apart by the general government for the support of a university in Iowa when it should become a state.

The grant was afterward accepted and, if it had been judiciously managed, would have supplied a liberal fund for the support of the institution it was designed to aid; but the lands were sold at an early day and for prices which supply but a meager annual income. To this has been added by the state a limited endowment, but the permanent funds of the university are wholly insufficient for its support.

The number of students has increased with the growth of the state until the facilities which appropriations thus made have supplied are wholly inadequate for the immediate needs of the school.

It is apparent that further aid must be provided, and the question arises, in what manner and to what extent this ought to be given.

It seems to me in every sense desirable that in addition to such appropriations as may be necessary for immediate investment in building, apparatus, etc., a permanent annual fund, sufficient to supply the reasonable wants of the institution, should be provided. This would enable those in charge to perfect and carry out plans

for the development of the school in everything essential to its usefulness, with an accurate knowledge of what could be relied on to meet the outlay.

If we would make the university what it should be—if we would place it relatively among the institutions of learning in this country where Iowa stands among the states of this union—we must adopt a liberal policy in the way of appropriations, and supply a permanent income therefor, so that proper plans for the improvement of the school can be adopted and carried forward in a business way.

A like condition exists in the normal school at Cedar Falls. This institution is wholly dependent upon temporary appropriations for means to perpetuate its existence. The last of these was only designed to supply its wants until the meeting of another legislature.

The same reasons exist here for a permanent fund that have been referred to in the case of the university. Ordinary business principles demand reasonable certainty as to means in carrying forward any enterprise that requires the use of considerable capital, and the schools of our state are no exception to this rule.

The appropriation for the normal school should not only be made in the form of a permanent endowment, but it too should be liberal, so as to make the school what it was designed to be—a source from which superior teachers of both sexes are to be supplied for our common schools. Besides this, as fast as the state is able to bear the expense, other schools of the same character should be established and liberally endowed in different parts of the state.

Every appropriation of this character will be returned to the great mass of our people in that which is more valuable than gold.

It should also be provided by law that a graduate's diploma from a normal school shall in all cases be equivalent to a first-class certificate from a county superintendent of schools, with discretionary power in the faculty to make it equivalent to those issued by the state board of examiners, whenever in the opinion of the members thereof the graduate is entitled thereto under the law.

This would be a just recognition of the efficiency of the school itself and a deserved remuneration of those who perform the labor necessary to complete the course required of students.

PHARMACISTS.

Serious complaint is made by the pharmacists of the state against many of the provisions of our statute regulating the con-

duct of their business. It can scarcely be denied that these complaints in some particulars are well founded.

Personally I can see little excuse and no justification for the great bulk of the provisions of this law, regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors for medicinal purposes. If it is necessary that such sales be made, those whose duty it becomes to transact the business are entitled to gentlemanly treatment, at least, from the public they serve. This they certainly do not receive under the provisions of this statute. Every section of it is framed upon the theory that these men as a class are unworthy the confidence of their neighbors; and before they can transact a necessary and lawful business, they are subjected to legal restrictions unknown to any other trade, and unnecessarily humiliating to every person engaged in it.

The state of Iowa owes it to herself and to those of her citizens who are required to handle alcoholic stimulants for necessary purposes, to put this business upon a reputable basis before the law, or abolish it at once and forever.

PROHIBITION AND LOCAL OPTION.

Among questions of local interest, none so stir the minds of our people as those which relate to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage.

No one underrates the consequences of intemperance. All concede the propriety of legislation to minimize, as far as practicable, its evils, but an irreconcilable difference of opinion exists whenever we undertake to determine what that legislation shall be. This naturally, and almost necessarily, arises from the mixed character of our population—the disparity in our education and customs, and in our views as to the legitimate exercise of legislative control over social habits that do not directly invade either public or private rights.

In considering this question we cannot rightfully shut our eyes to the fact that a considerable portion of our population have been taught from infancy to believe that the moderate use of malt and vinous liquors at least is not criminal, but instead thereof that it is actually beneficial.

It is needless to expect that a criminal statute, however armed with penalties for its violation, will change such convictions. If it were capable of controlling the habits of these people, the power which would subjugate their will would be force alone, and the

same force as that which awes into submission the subjects of every despotism on the face of the globe. It would be a degree of force that engenders fear—not love, not even respect for the law nor the government that enacted it.

Of all the means ever employed to improve the morals of men that of excessive punishment is the least effective. No patriot ever lived that drew the inspiration of his love of country from fines or imprisonment inflicted by the government he served.

Weak almost to stupidity is the ruler who covers the land he governs with a network of criminal laws into which his subjects are constantly stumbling. We cannot think alike. For some inscrutable reason society everywhere is divided into classes. Habits which are pleasant to one are distasteful to another. Christianity itself has its votaries and its foes. Why then should we expect to compel uniformity of sentiment on this subject?

If practical experiment was necessary to demonstrate the workings of this law, we have had it. No statute was ever supplied with better facilities for its enforcement or armed with more excessive penalties for its violation, considering the nature of the acts prohibited; and yet with all its terrors, with every branch of the state government in the hands of its friends, it has lain limp and lifeless, ignored, disregarded and despised in most of the large cities of the state from the day of its birth to the present time.

The friends of the law ignore the real situation and assume too much. They exaggerate the extent of intemperate habits among our people before its enactment and equally so the diminution of such habits since it became operative.

It is incapable of demonstration, except upon naked assumption that the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage in Iowa has diminished since the law took effect. It is a patent fact known to every one who has taken the pains to inform himself that in many of our cities, containing as they do a large fraction of our population, the only effect of the law has been to relieve the traffic in these liquors from legal restraint of every kind.

It is equally notorious that in the large cities of the state where the open saloon has been closed, a secret traffic sufficient to supply all the wants of the trade has immediately followed.

It must be apparent to unbiased minds that, in these localities at least, the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage has not been diminished by our prohibitory law, but instead thereof that it has been greatly increased, if want of legal restraint of any kind will produce that effect.

It is equally plain that a local option law will supply for all localities where our prohibitory law is now enforced precisely the same protection from the evils of this trade that they now enjoy, while it would give to localities where the present law is ignored a practicable method of controlling a traffic that all admit should be put under legal restraint of some kind.

I cannot agree with those who argue that it is better that this business should be conducted in violation of law than that it be conducted in pursuance thereof.

Through the aid of proper legislation the character of the commodities disposed of, the fitness of men who are permitted to engage in the business, and the class of persons to whom sales shall not be made can all be regulated and largely controlled, while the illicit traffic is open to the vilest of men for the sale of the most adulterated of liquids to every class of human beings that can be induced to buy.

There is not a large city in the world in which the demand for intoxicating liquors as a beverage is not supplied by either a legalized or illicit traffic therein, nor has there been, or will there be, such a city; and we must determine for ourselves whether this traffic in our own cities shall be put under such practicable legal restraint as is within our power, or be conducted outside of and in violation of all law, because we aim to accomplish more than is possible.

It is no argument in favor of this law that the courts have held it to be constitutional. Not one wrong of the British parliament or English king that led our forefathers into open rebellion against their government, and justified, in their opinion, a resort to the last and final arbitrament of men could have been impeached in the courts of England, because it was beyond the constitutional power of the government to inflict it.

In my own judgment the chief obstacle to the enforcement of this law lies in the fact that in and of itself it is a cruel violation of one of the most valued of human rights. By that act Iowa stands convicted of first making the business of the brewer and wine-maker legal, of watching, without warning, the expansion of their business within her borders until millions upon millions of the capital of her citizens had been invested therein, and then coldly wiping it out without one effort to compensate those who were ruined thereby.

We need not strive to console our consciences with the belief that this property has been turned into other and more useful chan-

nels. The simple truth is that wherever the law has been enforced its owners have been impoverished; and if anything has been saved from the wreck, it is the merest mite of its former value.

Ignoring at this time the question of whether or not the moral or material welfare of the state as a whole is being advanced by this law—a question upon which its friends and enemies take precisely opposite views—conceding all that is claimed for it in localities where it is enforced, and recognizing the evils of an unrestrained traffic in intoxicating liquors where it is not enforced, have we statesmen upon both sides of this controversy that can impartially consider the necessity of the situation?

If we have, they will find a middle ground between the extremes of opinion on this subject. They will leave to every locality in Iowa that desires it the present prohibitory law or its equivalent. They will force it upon no city or town where public sentiment rejects it. They will recognize the self-evident truth that a law which is entirely efficient for the control of this traffic in the rural districts of the state is wholly inadequate for that purpose in its great cities.

They will concede the right of self-government to citizens capable of deciding for themselves what is best for their own localities, and deny to people in one section of the state the power to determine what regulations shall control those of another, in whose affairs they have no rightful interest, and with whose circumstances and needs they are necessarily unacquainted.

They will look beyond mere questions of sentiment into the realms of practical business life, and observe the naked truth that a vast majority of the inhabitants of the civilized world are opposed to prohibitory laws upon principles that furnish no justification for the intemperate use of alcoholic stimulants.

They will realize that states to be prosperous must be governed by laws in accord with the judgment of the masses of men, and not by those that are opposed thereto.

But beyond all theories there is to my mind a more weighty reason still for a radical change in our prohibitory laws. The electors of the state, under circumstances that leave no room for doubt as to their meaning, have expressed their wishes in this respect.

It is impossible to read the platforms of the respective parties, the letters of acceptance of their candidates for governor, and remember the discussions that followed, without reaching the conclusion that no political issue was ever more clearly defined, more thoroughly discussed, or better understood by the masses than that

relating to this question in the campaign which preceded our last election.

To shut our eyes to this glaring truth is nothing less than a denial of ordinary intelligence on the part of those who cast their ballots on that occasion.

I am the keeper of no man's conscience except my own. Others may believe they have a higher duty to perform in this matter than any they owe the majority whose clearly expressed will they are willing to ignore.

They should not, however, mislead themselves into the belief that the people of Iowa have not, through the only medium known to our institutions for settling political issues, passed judgment on this.

Nor do I want the scope or effect of this judgment misunderstood. They have not undertaken to deprive any locality in the state where public sentiment upholds it, of our present prohibitory law or its equivalent. They have simply declared that each city, town and township shall have the right to determine for itself whether it will be governed by prohibitory laws or by a carefully guarded license law, the minimum fee for which shall be \$500, to be paid into the county treasury, with power in the municipalities to increase this fee for their own benefit. Those who believe in this decision, and feel it their duty to respect it, cannot rightfully depart from the letter of that decision as it was made. The license law, if any, which is to supersede prohibition must be all that has been promised. We cannot make the fee less, or provide one fee for the sale of one kind of alcoholic stimulants and another for others, without departing from the only plan which has received the approval of a majority of the people of the state.

We are bound in honor to furnish for localities adopting it a most carefully guarded license law.

The greatest care should be exercised to take the traffic out of the hands of immoral and irresponsible parties. Every safeguard possible should be thrown around those who are in this respect legitimate subjects of legal control. A willful sale to a minor or drunkard should be cause for revoking a license. Proprietors should be required to furnish in some form adequate security for the payment of all judgments, either criminal or civil, that may be obtained against them for any act done in the line of their business.

Drunkennes should be punished as a crime, and the habitual drunkard should be taken in charge by the state, tried by a commission and, if found guilty, sent to an asylum and kept there until

cured. He has no more right to be at large than the lunatic, for he is such when intoxicated; and when it is made known to him that he is to be treated by the law as he should be, and not by a vitiated public sentiment as he never ought to be, there will be fewer homes wrecked by dissolute men than now.

What Iowa needs is practical legislation on this subject, legislation that is broad enough to meet the views of more than a single class, that is liberal enough to command the respect of all her people, that is generous enough to invite to her borders every class of respectable persons, that is just enough to protect the person and property of every one of her citizens, and wise enough to exercise a practical control over a traffic that to-day is unrestrained in most of her centers of population.

He who strives for this is not the foe of temperance, but is the friend of a state too grand in its natural advantages, too broad in the diversity of its interests, too widely at variance in the education, habits and customs of its people to be appropriated by any single class or sect.

THE TARIFF.

Among the prerogatives of sovereignty is the conceded right to exact from each citizen his just proportion of the expense of maintaining the government that protects him.

In theory the problem of just taxation is simple, in practice most difficult. No system has yet been devised that distributes its burdens with impartial hands.

Thousands of people in our own state pay taxes on property they do not own; thousands of others fail to pay on that they do own.

Questions of increasing difficulty arise as we extend the field of inquiry. National as well as state governments must be supported by taxation. Not a dollar enters a public treasury that is not in some manner withdrawn from the substance of the people. No matter under what system it is collected—by what name that system is called—it is in fact a tax which the government exacts from its subjects on the theory that it is necessary for its own support.

If levied in the form of a direct tax that is paid to a collector, all realize when they pay it that they have contributed that much for public use.

If collected in the form of customs or a tariff, levied on imported goods we are compelled to buy, we can readily understand that the amount of this tariff is a tax which we pay for the use of the government in the enhanced price of the goods we purchase.

If by reason of this tariff, which increases the cost of imported goods, home manufacturers are enabled to exact a like price for like products on which no duty is paid, it is plain we pay in the increased price of these goods not a tax for public use, but a contribution to the manufacturer, which he appropriates to his own use.

Any system of taxation, the effect of which is to take from one class and give to another, is necessarily a partial and unequal distribution of public burdens.

If such a system is necessary because none can be devised that is absolutely fair to all classes, it is apparent its inequalities should be confined to the lowest practicable limit. This can be done by confining its operation to the one purpose of raising absolutely necessary revenue, and in no other way.

It is probably true that the burdens of an exorbitant protective tariff fall more heavily upon Iowa than upon most of her sister states.

Such a tariff is necessarily in conflict with the best interests of the one great industry which is the chief hope and sustenance of her people.

It increases the cost of nearly everything we buy and diminishes the price of almost everything we sell. It obstructs our own ports against the importation of products we are compelled to use, and foreign ports against those we produce and must send abroad.

It levies tribute upon a business in the throes of adversity for the benefit of another that produces millionaires by the thousand.

We denounce as a conspiracy a combination between a few men to increase by artificial means the cost of even the least of our necessities, and encourage by national law a vast monopoly that defies the laws of trade and regulates in its own interest the price of nearly everything we are compelled to buy.

We have followed this delusion of a protective tariff with the blind faith of a devotee, listening to the most deceptive of arguments, believing in the most patent of fallacies.

We have been willing to believe we could enrich our workmen by making millionaires of their employers, that we could increase the farmer's profits by a system of legislation that clogs the outlets for his surplus products, which must go abroad or smother the market we would nourish.

We have been clay in the potter's hands, molded to suit his selfish will, until with granaries overflowing, with flocks and herds that man can scarcely number, we are still poor, because by artificial means the profits of our own great industry have been de-

pressed below their normal condition, that those of another might be elevated above its own.

And yet, in the light of all our experience, we are confronted by a national policy for which we are as much responsible as any one, which is draining the national treasury by extravagant expenditures that a war tariff may be maintained in times of peace; which threatens to remove the tax on the worst of luxuries that it may be retained on the greatest of necessities.

It is true we can now only protest against this policy, but it is time to at least do this.

Let it be understood that the people of this state demand cheap clothing, cheap fuel, cheap implements of labor—in short, cheap necessities; that they are not interested in cheap whisky or tobacco, and that if compelled to take the latter cheap and the former dear, they will surely resent the injury, and our labor will not be in vain.

There are some things Iowa's public officers owe to her, others that she owes to herself.

She is entitled to the most faithful, most economical, most painstaking administration of all her affairs. If one servant of hers omits his duty in this respect, he deserves nothing but her scorn.

For her own good name she is bound to be absolutely fair and just to each one of her subjects; to foster education with a liberal hand; to honor her old soldiers and perpetuate their memories; to care for her unfortunates; and finally, to encourage by all just means in her power every one of the great industries which are the hope and dependence of her people.

If true to herself, if liberal in her statutory enactments and just in their application, no state in this union has a brighter future. If she falls short of that for which nature designed her, the blame therefor will rightfully descend upon those who make and administer her laws.

BIENNIAL REPORT

OF THE

AUDITOR OF STATE,

TO THE

GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF IOWA,

JULY 1, 1889.

J. A. LYONS,

AUDITOR OF STATE.

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

DES MOINES:

G. H. RAGSDALE, STATE PRINTER.

1889.