

THIRTY-FOURTH DAY

(LEGISLATIVE DAY OF WEDNESDAY)

MORNING SESSION.

COLUMBUS, March 7, 1912.

The Convention met pursuant to recess, the president in the chair. The delegate from Knox was recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAND: It was agreed yesterday in the opening of this discussion that we conceded that every man on the floor of this house, and I suppose every woman in the gallery, is sincere in this matter as well as on all questions that may come before the house. We can concede something else as the result of our labor in the last two weeks, and that is that we are independent of each other at least. We have found also in these discussions that we have come to have a high regard for each other, not only those on our side of the question, but those on the other side of the question, for ability, for integrity and for sincerity in these discussions. And we have also come to have a deep regret for any unfortunate speech or address or remark uttered on the floor of this house, especially if it is on our side of the question.

So there is nothing left for us to do except for each one of us to honestly and fairly voice his own sentiments regardless of whatever line-up we are in. Whether we like the company we are in or not, we have come to feel that each one of us is under obligation mainly to his own conscience and constituency and we will let it go at that.

Now, we who are also opposed to woman's suffrage concede the moral superiority of our mothers, wives, daughters and sweethearts, and that is conceded not only here but everywhere. As you remember, one of the leading addresses yesterday had its foundation in that concession and the whole argument was of that character. This, however is but a special application of that wider principle which some of us will remember Doctor Holland referred to when he said "The women are all smarter than the men. For we men also have high ideals and ambitions." Yes, the moral superiority of the woman is merely evidence that they are smarter than men. That means simply that they are superior morally because they are smarter. Some of us can not remember the time when we did not have sisters to rub it into us by saying "You boys are not expected to know very much, and, therefore, the Lord made sisters and women in order to furnish the brains." Some of us in our mature philosophic years have come to believe that "Man may have his will, but woman will have her way."

Where is the man
Who has the power and skill
To stem the torrent
Of a woman's will;
For if she will she will,
You may depend on't;
And if she won't she won't,
So there's the end on't.

Now we concede the fact, and we men who have been congratulating ourselves that we rule in politics have really been felicitating ourselves over something that doesn't exist. The fact is, that the unwomanly woman

is now demanding her way by force, and the womanly woman has always had her way by her wits. And that is true in your home and mine. It is true everywhere. It is true always. It is true in politics.

Now we concede that women are not only better than men, but we who doubt the wisdom of giving women equal suffrage concede also that the women are smarter than men, and we are proud of it, and it is for this reason in part that I speak this morning against woman's suffrage.

I am like the rest of you. When I came here the most of us expected without question to submit woman's suffrage to the electors of the state on a separate ballot, but since coming here and realizing the situation, and with the appeals coming from the other side to us, some of us have come to feel that those women who were busy campaigning for equal suffrage before our election and before our nomination and after our election did not represent all the womanhood of the state. There have been coming to us appeals from our mothers, wives and daughters in regard to this matter, so I have come to feel that some of us should be for our mothers, and our wives, and our daughters and against woman's suffrage because they want us to be, and for the ladies of the state, many of whom wish us thus to speak and vote.

Now, with regard to our wider constituency, we find from the records in the office of the secretary of agriculture that a straw vote was taken through the mayors of the various towns and villages, who gave the secretary the names of the leading women of their towns and villages. By sending directly from the office to them the inquiry as to whether they wanted woman's suffrage or not two out of three hundred have replied that they don't want it. Therefore I think it is incumbent on some of us men to speak in behalf of the quiet two-thirds as against the militant one-third.

We also find that in a wider ballot, taken in connection with other interests, that sixty per cent., so far as the records are now in, of the men and women of the state are not asking for woman's suffrage but are opposed to it. Therefore I think it is necessary for some of us to speak and vote for our mothers, wives and daughters, and for the ladies of the state who shrink from the burden of equal suffrage.

But I speak also today for the Grange. Some of them, as has been said, and some of the labor unions and the social unions and the granges, have taken a stand upon this question and are demanding equal suffrage. I know that is true so far as the Grange is concerned, but in order that I might find out whether the action of the State Grange fairly represented the sentiments of the members of the Grange, I made the inquiry in our county. I asked the local granges to vote on the question and as a result in one grange the men voted about equal on it, one-third of the women — the maids and the widows — voted for woman's suffrage, one-third of the women — the mothers — voted against it and one-third of the women refused to vote.

The PRESIDENT: The gentleman's time has expired.

Woman's Suffrage.

Mr. STALTER: Gentlemen of the Convention. It has not been my intention to take pare in these deliberations except so far as exercising the right of voting secured to every delegate of this Convention, but opportunity is afforded and I shall embrace it.

It is herein proposed to separately submit to the people of Ohio the question of woman's suffrage. To this submission I am opposed, because I can not vote to submit a proposal separately to the people and at the same time be opposed to the proposal myself. This Convention was called to alter, amend or revise the constitution. Its work must be submitted to the people for their approval. Proposals are introduced here in this Convention and the Convention must be in favor of the proposal or it can not be submitted. The proposal must bear the stamp of approval of this Convention or it can not be submitted to the people for ratification. To illustrate: When a proposal was before this Convention regarding the right of the legislature to allow three-fourths of a jury to return a verdict in civil cases, it was necessary for this body to determine as to their position upon the proposal. Was the Convention in favor of the submission? The vote that determined we were in favor of that proposal voted to submit it to the people. So I say that in this Convention, if you are opposed to woman's suffrage you can not vote for a submission of it to the people, for by so voting you give to the people the approval of this Convention to that proposal. A delegate who is opposed to woman's suffrage can not consistently favor the submission of it to the people because it will appear to bear the mark of approval of the Convention, and a vote then to separately submit the question of woman's suffrage to the people is in effect a vote for woman's suffrage. It is an attempt to have you express a favorable opinion on woman's suffrage by saying we will submit it to the people. I say, gentlemen of the Convention, that that method of procedure can not prevail, and that a person opposed to woman's suffrage in this Convention can not favor the proposition of separately submitting.

The gentleman from Mahoning [Mr. ANDERSON] has asked the question on the floor of this Convention whether a delegate can favor the submission of a license clause to the people and oppose the separate submission of the woman's suffrage question. He surely can. If a delegate favored license, he could vote a separate submission of it, but if a member were opposed to license, he could not vote to submit that separately, because a vote for a separate submission would be a vote in favor of license. So I say a delegate opposed to woman's suffrage can not vote in favor of a separate submission consistently. I say a man can consistently oppose a separate submission of this proposal to the people and at the same time favor a submission of the license clause. All that is necessary is a difference in your belief. You vote to submit the one in which you believe, and you vote against the submission of the one in which you don't believe.

Now, gentlemen of the Convention, I have said that I am opposed to a separate submission of this question and I shall so register my vote. I am opposed to the submission because I am opposed to woman's suffrage, and I can not vote to submit anything to a vote that I

am against. I am opposed to woman's suffrage for several reasons.

First, I am opposed to it because we are not a nation of individuals. We are a nation of families. The father is the natural head of the family. It is in that family group that the father has authority. The father then represents what? He represents the family. Then when the father goes to the polls and votes, whose interest is protected? The wife's, the daughter's and every interest within that family is protected. So that when you say to refuse woman the right to vote means taxing her without representation, I say it is not true. She is represented. She is a member in that family and is represented by her husband, and a vote by her husband is the vote of the representation of that family. And we, as a nation, are a nation of families. If the family is to be cut asunder, and if we are to become a nation of individuals, then the argument in favor of woman's suffrage may have some weight. But so long as the family is the foundation of our country and the groundwork upon which our government rests, I am against woman's suffrage.

The time of the gentleman here expired.

Mr. KING: Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention: One almost hesitates to discuss this question for fear that the very warm advocates of it will be a little too ready to undertake to ascribe reasons and motives. Now I want to say so far as I could be influenced by motives, those have been probably ingrained, but certainly more recently discussed about the the family hearthstone and in the community in which I reside, so that any previous opinion which I formed has only been solidified and intensified by the recent discussion of this subject.

I am opposed to this proposal for several reasons which to me are sufficient. I am opposed to it because the women of my community are opposed to it. I am opposed to it because in my experience the women of the household, the house women, with almost no exceptions, are opposed to woman's suffrage. A noise is made by a few who have little else to do in the world, but the woman who has trained her children up to maturity, who has brought forth and reared an honorable and upright family, can not be found, very often at least, advocating this proposal. And I would not feel that I had done my duty in this Convention if I returned home and said that in spite of every argument and request that has been made to me by the women with whom I associate and the woman who, by my side, has carried life's burdens for nearly forty years, I had favored this proposal here or at the polls.

Again, I am opposed to this proposal because it is not an honest proposal. It has tied up to it all the other conditions of suffrage for both man and woman, and the woman suffrage advocates were not honest when they wrote this proposal, undertaking to carry with it, almost by force — because of their present opinions and because of the injustice which they think was done them, even in the writing of the word "white" — the entire colored vote of the state.

Another reason: Gentlemen have undertaken to offer amendments designated to learn the opinion of the women of the state upon this proposal, and they have not been given a moment in which to discuss the proposition, but

Woman's Suffrage.

with swiftness and celerity motions have been laid on the table without any opportunity afforded to discuss the matter.

Now, gentlemen, you who favor this, no matter from what motives you favor it, why are you afraid of an honest, open discussion of the woman's suffrage proposal standing on its own feet? Why must you tie it up to some other problem so that you will gain the advantage, and why do you object to even a discussion of the proposition that the women themselves should be permitted to pass upon this subject?

For these reasons, gentlemen of the Convention, and desiring only to make my objection and stand on this plane, and not desiring to take your time, I appeal to you in the interest of the highest motives in the world to reject this proposal.

Mr. EARNHART: I offer an amendment.

The amendment was read as follows:

In line 15 of section 1, after the word "elections", insert the following:

At the primary election to be held May 21st, 1912, there shall be extended to the women of the state, the privilege of a referendum vote to determine whether they want or do not want equal suffrage.

At said election tickets shall be provided which read:

	For Equal Suffrage.
	Against Equal Suffrage.

Every woman who is over twenty-one years of age and who is a citizen of the state of Ohio, and who shall have been a resident of the state for one year next preceding said election, shall be entitled to vote at said referendum election. If in favor of "Equal Suffrage," by placing a cross-mark in the blank space opposite the words "For Equal Suffrage," if opposed by placing a cross-mark in the blank space opposite the words "Against Equal Suffrage."

If a majority of those voting are in favor of equal suffrage, then the proposition shall be submitted to the electors as designated in Proposal No. 91. If a majority of those voting should be against equal suffrage, then such proposal for equal suffrage shall not be submitted. Separate ballot boxes and separate poll books shall be furnished, and said referendum shall be conducted under the rules of said primary election.

Mr. FESS: I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: What is the point of order?

Mr. FESS: The amendment is virtually the same question that was submitted by other amendments. That matter has been before the house twice this afternoon—first, by the amendment offered by the delegate from Montgomery [Mr. STOKES], which was tabled; second, by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hamil-

ton [Mr. WORTHINGTON], which was also tabled. It can not now come up except upon the motion to reconsider and taking it from the table. I will read the rule:

The principle involved is that when the assembly has voted that certain words shall form a part of the resolution, it is not in order to make another motion which involves exactly the same question as the one it has decided. The only way to bring it up again is to move the reconsideration of the vote by which the words were inserted, etc.

Mr. LAMPSON: I desire to make a further point of order that under the enabling act which provides for this Convention, there is no authority to submit anything to anybody but the electors, and women are not electors.

Mr. KNIGHT: This is set for an entirely different date and in a different way, so that the first point of order is not at all tenable.

The second point of order, the enabling act, authorizes the manner and time of submitting the action of this Convention to the people of the state of Ohio.

Mr. FESS: The "electors," not the people—

Mr. LAMPSON: May I ask the gentleman a question? Don't you know that "people" means "electors" there?

Mr. KNIGHT: This provides for submission to the electors—

Mr. LAMPSON: No, to the women.

Mr. KNIGHT: Ultimately to the electors.

Mr. LAMPSON: But there is no provision in the enabling act to submit anything to women, to have any election for women. There is absolutely no authority for any such a thing.

Mr. KNIGHT: I did not know that legal questions were competent on a point of order, but it has been held by the very highest authorities that it is not illegal to submit such a matter as this in the way proposed.

Mr. LAMPSON: This proposal, if adopted at all, won't be adopted and become a part of the constitution until after the electors have voted upon it. Therefore, authority under it will not become complete until adopted by the electors, and the proposal to submit anything in advance of adoption or submission to the electors is wholly out of order.

Mr. EARNHART: The proposal is to submit it at the primary, when there will be no additional expense incurred. I can not see why anybody should object to that. In that way you can get the voice of the women whether you are going to give them the privilege or whether you are going to thrust it upon them.

Mr. LAMPSON: The secretary of state, who would have the responsibility of the necessary detail of carrying out the submission of whatever we submit, would never submit a proposal of that kind to non-electors. He could not do it.

The PRESIDENT: This is a question that the president dislikes to rule on. It seems that the question as to the legality is one that the Convention should rule on and not myself. As to the other, that the amendment is essentially the same as the others, there is some force in that, but the amendment is not identical with the

Woman's Suffrage.

others. The date is different and the proposition is to submit at a primary, and while the president feels it is practically the same question, yet in all such matters it has been the rule of the president to decide these questions so as to give the largest possible freedom to the Convention.

So in holding the amendment in order, it is before the Convention to be decided by the Convention, and not by the president, but the amendment will be allowed, and the question is now upon the motion to table.

Mr. LAMPSON: On that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. DOTY: I demand a call of the roll—no, I won't.

The roll was called on the motion to table, and resulted—yeas 63, nays 38, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Anderson,	Harter, Stark,	Rockel,
Baum,	Henderson,	Shaffer,
Brown, Highland,	Holtz,	Shaw,
Collett,	Kehoe,	Smith, Geauga,
Colton,	Kilpatrick,	Smith, Hamilton,
Crosser,	Kramer,	Solether,
Davio,	Lambert,	Stalter,
DeFrees,	Lampson,	Stamm,
Doty,	Leete,	Stevens,
Dunn,	Longstreth,	Stewart,
Fackler,	Malin,	Stilwell,
Farnsworth,	Marriott,	Taggart,
Farrell,	Mauck,	Tannehill,
Fess,	McClelland,	Tetlow,
FitzSimons,	Moore,	Thomas,
Fluke,	Okey,	Wagner,
Hahn,	Peck,	Walker,
Halenkamp,	Peters,	Watson,
Halfhill,	Pettit,	Weybrecht,
Harbarger,	Pierce,	Wise,
Harris, Hamilton,	Read,	Woods,

Those who voted in the negative are:

Antrim,	Harris, Ashtabula,	Miller, Ottawa,
Beatty, Morrow,	Hoffman,	Norris,
Beyer,	Hoskins,	Nye,
Bowdle,	Hursh,	Partington,
Brattain,	Johnson, Williams,	Price,
Brown, Pike,	Kerr,	Redington,
Cordes,	King,	Riley,
Cunningham,	Knight,	Roehm,
Donahay,	Kunkel,	Stokes,
Dunlap,	Leslie,	Tallman,
Earnhart,	Ludey,	Ulmer,
Elson,	Marshall,	Worthington.
Fox,	Miller, Crawford,	

The roll call was verified.

The motion was agreed to.

So the amendment was tabled.

The vice president, here took the chair.

Mr. ELSON: I realize that we are not debating the question at all. We have been debating the question of woman's suffrage, and the question before us is a submission of woman's suffrage to the people. I think it is perfectly proper though that we should debate this out of deference to the fair sex.

I can not agree with the gentleman at all who spoke recently that in voting for a submission of the question to the people of Ohio we are committing ourselves as to how we vote in that election. I believe the people of Ohio ought to have a right to vote on this subject if they want to. If we are convinced that they desire such an opportunity, we have no right to withhold it from them.

At the same time we need not make up our minds as to just how we are to vote at that election.

Mr. STALTER: Can this Convention submit anything to the people without in effect giving the measure the approval of this Convention?

Mr. ELSON: The proposition is to lay before the people of Ohio this great question, "Do you or do you not want woman's suffrage?" Must I say before I vote to submit such a question that I do want it? Why should I? We are asking them what they want, and not telling them what we want.

Now, as far as woman's suffrage is concerned, that is the question we are debating, and as I said, I think it is proper that we should do so. I have studied the question a good many years. I am on one side of the question part of the time and then on the other. Usually I am on the fence. I don't know where I stand now. I was a kind of anti yesterday. Then I heard the speech of Delegate Kilpatrick and I was on the other side, and then I heard from our good friend from Coshocton [Mr. MARSHALL] and he got me back on his side of the question; then I didn't know where I was, and I thought I would go and get some evidence on the matter. I rushed out of this room intending to ask the first woman I met what she thought of it, and the first one I met was one of our bright stenographers, and I said, "Do you want to vote?" and she said "Indeed, I do not." And that steadied me up a little on the anti-side.

Mr. ANDERSON: Did she hear the speech of the delegate from Coshocton [Mr. MARSHALL]?

Mr. ELSON: However, I want to make a point or two on the anti-side chiefly, because most of them are speaking on the other side. Remember you must spell that anti—don't forget that.

Our good friend Judge Peck from Cincinnati said yesterday that we needed the moral force of the women in our Ohio politics. I agree with him, but I differ with him as to the way in which we can get it. I believe we already have the moral force of the women of Ohio in our politics, and I do not believe to give the women a vote would increase the moral force at all. That is my opinion. I have the profoundest regard for Judge Peck's opinion in most things, but I do think he is mistaken in the opinion that to give the women a vote is a way to cure all the political ills. Our friend from Greene [Mr. FESS] spoke about purifying politics. I do not believe it would purify politics to give votes to women. I do not think it has done so in Colorado or in the other states, and I do not know why it should do so here. I believe woman's influence is as great without having the ballot as with it. Now a word as to what our good friend from Scioto said. He said he was not ready to give the women a vote until the male vote was made decent. I supposed he meant absolutely pure. This gentleman can write whole constitutions, but I think he is very theoretical and impractical on that subject. If God never made a man until all the other men here were pure and decent, the human race would run out before long.

It was stated yesterday that if one woman in Ohio desired to vote she ought to have a right to vote. I would agree to that only on the condition that it would be possible to give her the vote without affecting the other women, but when there are half a million in Ohio,

Woman's Suffrage.

should we enfranchise the whole vast number simply because one woman desires to vote?

Mr. DOTY: Sure.

Mr. CROSSER: If this half million don't want to vote, what harm would it do if they had a right to vote?

Mr. ELSON: I am coming to that. I heard that statement yesterday, and I hardly expected it today, that all the rest could stay at home with perfect complacency. Does not the right to vote involve the duty to vote? We say so with regard to men. We are constantly blaming men for staying at home from elections and shall we enfranchise hundreds of thousands of women and at the same time say to them, if you do not wish to vote remain at home, it makes no difference? Is that the kind of citizenship we want?

Mr. DOTY: That is the kind we have.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The time is up.

Mr. ELSON: I hadn't come to my main point yet. I move that I be given one minute longer.

The VICE PRESIDENT: If there is no objection the gentleman can have one minute longer.

Mr. DOTY: To speak on his point.

Mr. ELSON: My main point is this, that giving the women a vote is not a matter of privilege, but a matter of imposing on them a duty and a burden; and I believe it is selfishness in the men to do so. I think we should look upon it in that light, that it would be a great burden added to the burdens that the women already have for us to ask them to come in and help us to run the government. If I were a woman I think I would be an anti and I think I would take that position. I would say to the men of the United States, "Look here! If you can't run this government yourselves, confess it, throw up your hands and say so, and we will take hold and try to run it."

Mr. THOMAS: Ever since I became old enough to vote I have stood for equal rights, equal rights to women to vote with men, equal wages, equal hours, equal rights in every form that pertains both to our industrial and our political life. We take them into our labor organization on an equality with men. They pay the same dues that the men pay where they are in the same organizations. We fight their battles industrially in much the same way as we do the battles of the men, and we, as trade unionists, believe if they were given the right to vote they could bring better industrial life for the people of this country than we are at present enjoying.

One of the speakers, I think it was the gentleman from Scioto [Mr. EVANS], seems to me to have struck the keynote, as did Mr. Elson, of the position of the antis in refusing to extend suffrage to women, and that was that they wanted the men made perfect to commence with. And they seem to think that some particular method can be brought about whereby we can be placed on some high moral plane that they have been referring to and they seem to forget that we all belong to one human family.

The gentleman from Scioto [Mr. EVANS] raised the point that property rights should determine the question as to whether either a man or a woman would have the right to vote, and he and all the others who think that property rights should govern seem to forget that all the corruption that has come into our political life—every bit of it—has come because of the effort to protect

property rights and has been brought about by the men who own property, and the larger amount of property the bigger the corruptionist.

John Fitch, connected with the editorial staff of the charities publication, makes this remark to those people who are always contending for property rights as being the standard by which men's character, both moral and otherwise, is to be determined. He says: "But before we can ask the poor and uneducated man to have respect for the law, we must ask the rich and the powerful to respect it. For the worst part of anarchy is the anarchy of the strong." The delegate from Wyandot [Mr. STALTER] back here, raised the question that the man as the head of the family should be the one to exercise the right to determine for the family what is needed in our political life, and the delegate from Knox [Mr. McCLELLAND], in discussing the same question, admitted that if woman wanted her way she would have it whether or not. So she is determining that question to some extent whether she goes to the polls or not.

Now, on this thing of asking the women whether they want suffrage or not, the delegate from Athens said he walked out of the room the other day and asked one stenographer whether she was in favor of woman's suffrage or not, and she said she was not. The first day this matter came up for discussion I walked around the other side and asked two of the stenographers whether they wanted woman's suffrage and they said they did, and as the majority determines this question I have two to one on the matter.

In my early political life I had never been connected with any of the old parties. I have always been in what might be known as the radical political movement—first in the times of the old union labor, then the populist and then the socialist labor, and lastly with the socialists' movement for a number of years. Every one of these political parties has always stood for equal suffrage for both men and women. We admit women to our political party and they pay dues the same as the men, and our women vote on all questions in our party in much the same manner as the men, so that there is nothing inconsistent in my stand here, fighting for woman's rights. The delegate from Erie [Mr. KING] brought up the question of tacking on the striking out of the word "white" in the provision so as to attract the colored vote and bring about equal suffrage. Probably some of you may know it and probably others do not, that when Susan B. Anthony went to Chicago to preach the gospel of woman's suffrage she first made application to every white church in the city, or at least every church she could get in contact with, in the effort to preach her gospel and she was turned down, and some friends suggested that there was a little colored church around the corner where she might get the right to speak and she went there, and they granted it, and the first speech made by Susan B. Anthony in the city of Chicago was made in a colored church, and I am satisfied that as large a per cent, if not a larger per cent, of the colored people will be for this proposition than there will be among the whites. The socialist position on this question of equal suffrage is best stated by August Bebel, the leader of the German socialists, and socialists generally have adopted that statement of his as their general statement covering their position. As

Woman's Suffrage.

I read it I want to ask each one of you to determine in his mind whether there is one thing in it you can not stand for and agree with, because it simply gives woman the same privilege to determine for herself those questions that she believes in and let her determine in her own way, when she gets the equal privilege, as to how she shall use it. This is the statement:

Woman has the same right as man to unfold her faculties and to the free exercise of the same; she is human as well as he; like him she should be free to dispose herself as her own master. The accident of being born a woman, makes no difference. To exclude woman from equality on the ground that she was born female and not male—an accident for which man is a little responsible as she—is as inequitable as would be to make rights and privileges depend upon the accident of religion or political bias.

The time of the gentleman here expired.

Mr. THOMAS: I would like to finish this quotation.

The chair recognized Mr. Johnson, of Williams.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Williams: I had a half dozen speeches prepared for this occasion and I expect I will read the weakest one in the excitement. I want to say in the beginning that I have the highest regard for Judge Peck and his opinion and my remarks will not refer to him in the least.

I have as high regard for the women of Ohio as any man in this Convention, but I will not leave it to the members here to decide; I will leave it to ninety per cent of the mothers and wives of Ohio. Now I will read some of the remarks that I got up at four o'clock to write, and I was a little bit sleepy at the time, too.

More than a quarter of a century ago I spent four winters in this city, first, as a member of a democratic general assembly, and then as a member of a republican general assembly. I have had some other experience in public life, but in this Convention, yesterday, I first saw a successful attempt to throttle free speech, and this is a Convention in which the members were selected as nonpartisan! If the proceedings of yesterday were nonpartisan, then I ask the Lord to deliver us from that kind of nonpartisanship.

I have sat in this Convention and heard members denounced as enemies of women—yes, the enemies of a women—because they dared to even intimate that it is wrong to force the ballot upon them without their consent, but yesterday was not the first time in my life that I have heard the self-constituted guardians of the people proclaim their loyalty for them and denounce all that do not coincide with their schemes.

We are told that if we refuse to vote to submit the amendment giving the men the opportunity to force woman suffrage upon the women of this state, against their consent, and then vote for the initiative and referendum we are inconsistent. In my opinion and from my standpoint such a statement is absolutely false, but if perchance it be true, then I will fall back upon the proposition presented by Dr. Washington Gladden in the Century Magazine many years ago, that "inconsistency is a dose well shaken and taken by the best of people."

A member of this Convention said that if we submit a license clause and refuse to submit the woman's suffrage proposition we place the women of Ohio on a lower scale, or rather beneath the brewers. I would like to talk about the brewers, but time will not permit, so will only say that I have about as much respect for the brewers who furnish the stuff for the bar at the Hartman Hotel as I have for some members of this Convention who are continually keeping things brewing on the floor of this Convention, and when they are through "brewing" move the "gag" rule upon the rest of us.

The chairman of the committee on Equal Suffrage said on the floor of this Convention that if there was only one woman in Ohio that demanded the right to vote, then it was our duty to force the ballot upon all the rest of the women of Ohio, and one or two other members of this Convention expressed the same views. That would mean that if Emma Goldman, the anarchist, lived in Ohio and desired to have the right to vote, then every woman in Ohio should have the ballot forced upon her for the special benefit of Miss Goldman.

So many of us are apt to forget that our individual rights are at all times to be subordinated to the public good. Chief Justice Waite and Chief Justice Marshall of the United States supreme court were both of the opinion that the elective franchise was not an inherent right, notwithstanding the opinion of some of the members of this Convention. Gentlemen of this Convention, it is now two months since we have been in session and in all that time I have not asked the attention of this body for twenty minutes. Think of it! And now when one of the most important questions that ever came before a constitutional convention is under discussion, I am allowed ten minutes to discuss it and help to defend the women of Ohio.

And remember, Mr. President, we are accorded this privilege after having fought like Trojans to keep from being entirely throttled or otherwise allowed to state our position in three minutes. Was there ever attempted a more damnable and bare-faced scheme? We are told that we are unworthy of our mothers and our wives if we do not fall down and worship at the shrine of those who wish to impose other burdens upon the women of Ohio.

No one more than I knows the value of a mother's love. She was left a widow at the early age of twenty-six with three small children from three to seven years of age, and, refusing to listen to the advice of some of her friends to put us out with strangers, she bought a cheap house and lot in a small village within eight miles of where I now live, and there she took in long rolls of wool to spin for her neighbors.

She spun this wool on a large wheel and many and many a day I saw her walking the floor back and forth spinning out the long threads and winding them up on the spindle and singing some good old Methodist hymn as she made the wheel hum. Do you think I can forget a mother like that? She did other grand and noble deeds that I well remember now, at this distant day, when some of us were classed as the enemies of women. I resent the classification made by some of the so-called friends of women and prefer to make my own classification or submit to the judgment of ninety per cent of the wives and mothers of Ohio. The women of Ohio

Woman's Suffrage.

do not want the ballot. I live in one of the most intelligent communities in the state, and in the subschool district in which I live there are eleven teachers or ex-school teachers, and most of them are women, yet not a woman has ever cast a vote at any of the elections.

I had intended to speak somewhat about the investigations I have made in Colorado, Washington, Australia, and New Zealand, but I see I will have no time to do it. In my opinion woman's suffrage has not bettered any country where it has been tried. In Colorado the women vote the wet ticket as freely as the men. I will just say a little about woman's suffrage in New Zealand. I met and talked with a gentleman living at Auckland who has a wife and three daughters who always vote as he does. He favored woman's suffrage and was largely instrumental in having it adopted in that country, but after sixteen years of trial he said he knew it was a failure. He was a gentleman who on account of ill health had to leave the southland. He intended to go to Australia, but his wife did not want to leave her native land. He let his wife's wish run him and he came to the northland and settled in Auckland and I got some information from him. I don't want to make a speech on the question, but I will give you a few pointers and let that go as my speech. According to the late official statistics there are three hundred and seven male bartenders in New Zealand and three hundred and ninety-six barmaids——

The time of the gentleman here expired and several moved that his time be extended.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Williams: I don't want any more time. I spurn it. After the occurrences that took place yesterday I don't want it. I ask no favors from anybody on the face of God's footstool. The motion coming from my friend the delegate from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] almost tempts me to accept it, but I don't want to transgress and I shall decline. It seems to be all one way anyway, and the gentlemen on the other side won't permit argument. It seems that when you force woman's suffrage you will all be happy, and I will assure you that your panacea will make me happy if it does you.

At the request of Mr. Watson, chairman of the committee on Printing, the members of the committee on Printing were allowed to absent themselves for the purpose of opening bids concerning printing.

Mr. KNIGHT: There have been many things said and done in the last two months that will appear strange in time to come, and I think it will go down as the strangest of all that this Convention undertakes to dispose of a question of this import in a day and a few hours. In other words, that it courteously permits ten-minute speeches to those who desire to speak in defense of the home and the family and women! It is a gracious act, at least, to allow any of us that much time at the hands of the Convention!

I want to say at the outset that living here in Franklin county in the center of the state of Ohio, my personal friends among the estimable ladies of this city are divided among themselves upon this question. I have quite as many warm personal friends among the women on one side as on the other. I have had the honor to present at this Convention petitions signed by something over fifteen hundred asking for suffrage.

There were both men and women on that petition. I have also had the honor of presenting to this body the names of over fifteen hundred women who did not want suffrage and the names of several hundred men in addition. I beg, therefore, since my two honored colleagues from this county are representing the first fifteen hundred names, that I may be permitted to represent the other eighteen hundred for the next six minutes, which I believe is my time.

We were told yesterday that the right to vote is an inherent, natural right. That can be disposed of in one word, if we are sensible; and that is, "bosh!"

We were told also by an estimable lawyer on this floor, who ought to know better, if he does not, that it is the right of every citizen to vote. He ought to know that it has been time and time again decided by the highest courts of this land that there is no connection between citizenship and voting. If every "citizen" is allowed to vote, then your boy or girl eighteen years of age has the right to vote, because he or she is a citizen of the United States. And it is just as absurd that a woman or someone else has the right to vote because he or she is a citizen as to say that you have an inalienable right to vote.

Now there are just two reasons that should unite for women to be given the privilege to vote. First, because the community thinks they ought to have it. And secondly because the women think they need it.

If the majority of the women of the state of Ohio want the ballot they will get it but those who are so anxious to force it upon them have thrice within the last eighteen hours refused to permit a discussion of the question to submit it to the women of this state whether or not we men shall impose a burden upon them which they must bear because we want their help. That is the argument put up by my venerable friend from Cincinnati [Mr. PECK] that we need them, and that, therefore, we will impose a burden on them whether they want it or not. Why do women need or want the ballot? Do they need it in Ohio?

We know that the property laws of this state now are more favorable to women than to men, and they may be made as unfavorable to women as they are in some of the western states where the women vote, if the vote is given to women in this state.

Do the women need it, and do they want it, that women's hours of work may be made better, or may be made worse, as they are in some of those western states where the women have the ballot?

Do the women need the ballot that the labor laws for women may be made as poor here as they are in every state where the woman has a vote? We have the best child's labor legislation in this state of any in the United States; and the women got it without the ballot; and they never would have gotten it with the ballot. Do they want our legislation turned backwards to conform to the standards of the states where the women have a vote?

Do they want it so they can do better social service work? Gentlemen, I say to you that the women whose names are on some of these petitions are the women who today in Columbus are leading the social-service work, the charity work, and many of the women who are leading in that work come here today and say to us, "We do

Woman's Suffrage.

not want the ballot imposed upon us as an added work. We can do these things which we are better fitted to do than you are, we can do this better without the ballot than with it."

Do they want it that the schools may be improved? Why, bless you, they have had the ballot for fifteen years to make the schools better and in this city, in an important election where the women had a right to vote, out of forty-five thousand women less than eighteen hundred registered and less than fifteen hundred voted.

The women are doing better work today in helping build up the schools in this city, and I say it with the greatest gratitude, the women on both sides of the question are doing better work today in the city of Columbus for the betterment of school conditions without the ballot than they could if they were immersed in politics all the time as this forces them to be.

How do we know that the women want the ballot? We don't know in this Convention. Where have we had the opportunity to know what the women want?

Now, as a last word, this is one of the most inopportune times at which this subject could come before the people of the state of Ohio. We are here for the purpose of submitting to the people of Ohio a large number of propositions and there will be a large number submitted for their suffrage when this Convention gets through with its work. And I submit that a question which is as debatable as this one, debated everywhere but in this Convention—here there is apparently no time for debate upon it—I submit it would be wrong to place this matter along side of the many other things. For instance, there is that thing dearer to me than many others, the principle of the initiative and referendum, and I submit to put this matter up along side of that is to endanger some of the others, and if you give us the initiative and referendum the men who believe that the women should have a vote will have an ample opportunity within a year to bring this question up as an independent question which will stand or fall on its own merits and not drag down some other problem. It seems to me, therefore, without respect to how we feel on the question, if the women of this state are really patriotic and really desire to help at this time in the betterment of our constitution, they will see to it that this proposition is not forced upon the voters at a time when it is likely to drag down other matters with it. For one I am perfectly willing after the constitution is disposed of that that question shall come up to the voters of the state in that way.

Now one other last word. I object entirely to the proposition that merely because a proposal has been introduced in this body we are merely a channel by which or through which it shall be passed up to the voters of the state to express their judgment on it. There have been offered three hundred proposals. Is it true that this Convention is to do nothing but formulate a method by which those shall go to the people, or are we to form some judgment and submit matters with an expression of our own personal opinion? For one I shall not vote for any proposition to be submitted to the people and voters of the state that I cannot vote for at the polls when the question comes up.

Mr. HOSKINS: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: I regret the limited time we have

to discuss this question, and yet I don't know that I will consume the time allotted to me under the rule. I do not think it possible that I could say anything new upon the question or add anything to the discussion of the question whatever. I disagree with these gentlemen of the Convention who believe it is their duty to submit this question to the voters of the state of Ohio regardless of their own convictions upon the proposition. I agree with the statement of the gentlemen who just left the floor that this Convention ought to exercise its own judgment, that it ought to be a deliberative body, not a body to transmit the proposals that come in here to the voters of this state for their approval or rejection.

Now, gentlemen of the Convention, we are probably all more or less controlled in our convictions by our local surroundings and our local environments. To me this question is the height of absurdity. I may be old-fashioned, I may be foolish upon the proposition, but I heard these questions discussed in the country school house twenty-five or thirty years ago, and the same reasons that are being urged here pro and con were urged there in those years long gone by. I do not know that the demand for the ballot for women has made any progress in this country of ours in these twenty-five years. It is possible it has been conferred in a few places where it did not exist at that time, but wherever it has been conferred in our commonwealth it has been a failure. In my own community women have had a right to vote on school propositions for fifteen years, and with the exception of one single occasion in all these fifteen years they have not availed themselves of the opportunity.

In all my own personal acquaintances, in all those good women with whom I have been fortunate to associate, I have yet the first one to even ask me directly or indirectly to support a proposition of this kind. With unanimity they are opposed to it or are absolutely indifferent.

I agree with my friend from Williams that the time is too limited for us who believe there is no demand for the submission of this proposition to present our cause to the Convention. Man after man in this Convention has said that he did not believe in the principle of this proposal and that he will oppose the proposal at the polls, and yet he proposes to submit it and by the multiplicity of questions to be discussed on the different things he will endanger the proposals that are so important.

Now my ground for opposition is not only my own belief in the question, but it is further my belief that there is no general demand in the state of Ohio for this proposal.

I absolutely disagree with the proposition made by the chairman of the committee that if one woman of the state of Ohio demands it then it is our duty to give it to her. I believe our rights in society are relative rights. We have relationship with each other. If we could give the right to one woman without involving others that might be all right, but if you submit this and have it carried by the voters of the state you will get a worse condition in our political system or you will compel the great body of women of the middle class, who don't want to exercise this right of suffrage, to go to the polls in order to protect society from that element that I need not mention in this Convention, to protect society from their influence in politics and their influence upon local

Woman's Suffrage.

affairs. I say if I thought there were a general demand throughout the state I might vote to submit it. I believe there is not a general demand for the submission of this proposal. I do not believe anything new can be presented on the subject, but I would feel derelict to the people of my county and to my duty to the state of Ohio if I contented myself with merely voting against the proposal. I would feel that I had not discharged my duty unless I at least raised my voice in humble protest against what I believe to be absolutely injurious to our political system and a step which I think the people of this country ought not take. I voice the sentiment I know of ninety per cent. of the citizens of the county I represent, whether male or female, upon this proposition and that is we do not want to force this upon the women of our land. I think the sentiment for it is largely a manufactured sentiment; but go out and interview the wives of the farmers along the roads of Auglaize county, interview the women who come to the Methodist church and the women who belong to the literary clubs, if you please, up in that benighted country of Northwestern Ohio and ask them if they want this duty—because if it is conferred it will become a duty and a necessity in order to protect themselves from the worst element of society—and the answer will be unanimous or practically so that they do not want the duty thrust upon them.

The gentleman from Franklin [Mr. KNIGHT] has outlined my ideas exactly in saying this is not an inherent right. It is a duty; it is a burden, which the social fabric has cast upon us. We would not be conferring a vested right on women, but we would be placing upon her shoulders a burden which a great many of them are unwilling to assume. It was unfair for this Convention to reject a proposition to permit the women themselves to say whether they shall assume this burden. I say you are afraid to pass this question up to the women themselves to say whether or not they should assume it, and that is a species of cowardice. When you voted down that amendment of the gentleman from Cincinnati [Mr. WORTHINGTON] and when you voted down the proposition this morning, you showed cowardice.

Women have come to me since this discussion has been in progress, the best women of this city, and protested; and probably it is largely through their solicitation and through their insistence that I have even attempted to raise my voice against this proposal.

I appeal to you to think before you put this proposal before the people of the state of Ohio. Let us do the important work of this Convention and when the initiative and referendum is adopted in the state of Ohio, as I believe it will be, if this general demand for woman's suffrage exists, the people of the state, as my friend from Franklin county says, will then have an easy way to settle this matter.

Mr. JONES: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: I want first to join in the protest which we have already had from two or three members of the Convention against the conception of the nature of our duty which, I am sorry to say, a good many of the members appear to have, and which I think has been due to a want of reflection upon the nature and character of this duty that we are all called upon to perform, that we are merely to submit to the people whatever anybody asks to be submitted. We forget that this body

was called and that the members of it were elected with reference to their qualifications as members of a legislative body. We were told when we were canvassing the voters for election to this body that it would be the greatest opportunity that any individual probably in his lifetime would have of contributing the highest order of service to the good of the people of Ohio, and we were told that that was so because we were going to be formulators of the organic law which would control the destinies of the people of this state for probably half a century. Now, with that great duty imposed on us, with that reliance placed in us by the people who sent us here, that we were selected because of our special fitness supposedly to determine what was the best character and form of organic law for the people of Ohio to govern them for the next fifty years, we now propose to throw aside all responsibility, to disappoint all the expectation that the people had in us when they voted for us, and say we are mere instruments for passing up what is to be the best organic law of the state of Ohio to the people. I say that we are entirely mistaking our duties and responsibilities when we take that view, and no man with the proper regard for the purpose in which he was sent here can say to himself "I am opposed to woman's suffrage, or opposed to this, that or the other thing, but yet will submit it to the people to vote upon."

Why, the people don't want to determine for themselves. They don't want to hammer out for themselves what is the best form of organic law. If they wanted to do that they would not have this Convention here at all. But the thing they wanted done was that after a body of a hundred and nineteen men was selected, which in their judgment was the best qualified of any hundred and nineteen in the state to perform that work, was that these one hundred and nineteen men should perform the work and present to them for their final determination the result of their very best judgment upon the subjects that came before them. Now, I say, we should do that very thing—

Mr. PECK: Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. JONES: The time is so limited that you will have to excuse me, Judge.

In view of that function we have to perform, let no man say he will refuse to exercise his judgment with regard to this proposal, but will cast the responsibility off on the people to determine the matter for themselves.

I might say further that that duty rests upon every member of the Convention just as heavily if he is for this proposal as it is if he is against it. It makes no difference.

Now, coming to the question, and it is very little we can say in the brief time allotted to us, there are one or two or three things that underlie the whole proposition.

It has been said that if one woman wants the ballot it should be given her. That was very well disposed of by Prof. Knight as being bosh and nonsense. What is the first inquiry as to giving anybody the right to vote? Why, we do that in order that the people of the whole state may be governed the best possible. Now, in order that they may be governed the best possible, what is required of the voter? If you are engaged in the duty

Woman's Suffrage.

of securing to the people of the state the best possible form of government, what is the first thing to do?

The first thing is to exercise the ballot or else you are going to fail to accomplish the purpose for which you are given it. The first question involved is are the persons to whom you are proposing to give the ballot capable of exercising it so as to serve the best interests of the people, give them the best government possible? Upon that there is no difference of opinion. We all agree that the woman's intelligence and character and morals and everything else that enters into the question of the exercise of the franchise are fully equal to men's. There is no dispute about that, so we can pass all that by. Now, what is the next thing? No difference how capable a man is, or how honest a man is, or how moral a man is, or how wise a man is, when he is given the ballot, the instrument which is to be used merely for the purpose of giving the people the best possible government, no matter in how high a degree he possesses all of these qualifications, if he doesn't exercise it no good comes of it. Now, what is the great objection today to our present system of government? What is the great cause of the complaint against our present system of government? Not that men are not able or intelligent or moral enough to give us good government, but that in the exercise of the franchise they don't do it, that we don't get the best representatives, that we don't get the best results from the use of that instrument which has been conferred in the form of a ballot.

Why don't we get them? There are several reasons. The first is, a certain class of men are too busily engaged in their private affairs to pay attention to their civic duty. Secondly, there is another class of men who have not the intelligence for the highest order of exercise of the ballot.

There are various reasons with which we are all familiar, and the most unfortunate thing about this is that a certain element on whom the franchise has been conferred are here, there and everywhere subject to influences that are brought to bear upon them. The greatest trouble with our representative form of government today, the trouble more than anything else, is that there is too large an element of the shifting vote that votes here and there, as illustrated in Adams county, this state, where, if the judgment of the courts is to be believed, there was one out of every four or five of that character.

Now I pass up to the question of whether woman is capable of exercising that duty. The material and the only material question, it occurs to me, for consideration is, first, whether she will do it, and second, if she will do it, whether it is going to detract from the influence and power she exerts in other respects in our social economy that will be more of a loss than we can gain by conferring upon her the ballot.

The president resumed the chair during the remarks of the delegate from Fayette.

The PRESIDENT: The gentleman's time is up. The chair recognizes the delegate from Cuyahoga [Mr. FITZSIMONS].

Mr. FITZSIMONS: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: I have listened with a good deal of interest and attention to the arguments that have been made here on this proposal and I have resolved in my

own mind that the arguments that have been advanced against the right of giving the women in this land a voice in their public affairs is a repetition of the voice that was raised against giving to your paternal ancestors a vote at all. That same line of argument was used by those who lived and controlled under the superstition of the Divine right of those who by privilege were enjoying the fruits of others' labor, but were unalterably opposed to giving your paternal ancestors the right to transact their own affairs in their own way. Tell me, if you can, why the mother of the son you call on to defend the institutions of this land on the battlefield should not have something to say about the policies of this nation? Is her sacrifice not worthy of that right? You tell us that the women do not want the ballot; that they are satisfied with existing conditions and want no change. Some of us remember that there were slaves on plantations in the South who were against any change as to slavery, and who thanked God that He gave them a master to look after their interest; and yet with all that contentment on the part of the slave we spill the blood of two million men to remove that injustice, and in addition gave to the freedman the unrestricted ballot without any solicitation on his part. Can we in justice refuse less to our mothers, wives, sisters, daughters? Other nations have advanced, other of our states have joined the progressive ranks. Do not let Ohio be the "Z" of the alphabet.

I heard my colleague from Hamilton [Mr. BOWDLE] yesterday suggest that we should take the word "male" out of the constitution. I say don't do it. It took centuries of warring and millions of broken heads to write that word into the constitution. It did not come by resolution. It took hard-fought battles and long campaigns to put it there. Take nothing out, let us add to it. Do common justice to the mothers, wives and sisters of this land that they may have something to say as to their economic and political conditions and a voice in the making of laws that they are expected to conform to.

Talk about the incongruity of women sitting in the presidential chair or on the supreme bench! How many times it would have been a welcome change, incongruous as you may call it, rather than gazing on the specimens of the officials we were compelled to view!

Now, I want to say another word for the women when they come into their right to vote. If you ask them why they are for this or for that particular party, I will guarantee you will never get the answer that I have listened to all my active life of forty years from men, "that they vote the ticket because Grandfather had voted it." The ladies will never take Grandmother for their excuse.

Now, my friends, there is nothing that will stand the test of time but absolute justice. If we have not the courage of our convictions, if we have not that courage which stands up for the right at all costs, we will go down. For that reason extend this right to the women of this land to pass on their own affairs, and if they are neglectful of exercising it to the full extent of their responsibilities and of its limits that fault will not be ours. We have removed the obstacles that stand in their path, and if they are not equal to the occasion it will be time enough then for us to criticise them for their neglect because of their lack of appreciation of it. But from

Woman's Suffrage.

my experience that will never be necessary, for this reason: If we are just we will not recognize the suggestion, as the gentleman from Scioto [Mr. EVANS] expressed it yesterday, that we handle the elective franchise with so much blundering ourselves that we would better correct our own methods before giving the women the ballot; but I say, as one member of the Constitutional Convention of the state of Ohio, recognizing that we men have blundered in the handling of the elective franchise, that I will not for one moment attempt revenge on the women of the state by denying them the ballot on account of the mistakes we have made in the past as citizens and voters.

Mr. BOWDLE: I feel very strongly upon this question because with my scrapbook of several years ago before me I find that I have written much against female suffrage and again looking over it I find that I have written a couple of things favoring it. Therefore, to have no mistake and to get my remarks within the time which the proponents of female suffrage have allowed us, I have reduced my address with difficulty within the ten minutes prescribed, but if it should appear that I am about to exceed the ten minutes I wish that some of my good dry friends who took occasion to denounce me the other day will get up and handsomely redeem themselves by moving that I be given two or three minutes more.

A vote for or against this proposal does not necessarily indicate one's position on the ultimate question of the feminine franchise.

Several classes are represented in this Convention.

There are those who oppose suffrage, but are willing to submit the question to the people.

There are those who oppose suffrage, but are unwilling to submit the question to the people because they do oppose it, and who feel that they cannot in good conscience present issues to the people in which they themselves do not believe.

There are those who do not oppose it, but are opposed to submitting the question because it may offer to the enemies of the new constitution simply another argument with which to defeat the document. (These persons believe that their full duty is done when they give the initiative and referendum as a means through which woman's suffrage may be gotten.)

There are those who do not oppose it, but believe that the question should be submitted to the women themselves. Such men accept the position of such noted persons as Lyman Abbott and Theodore Roosevelt.

Representative government is an undefined thing. Who is represented by the representatives? If he is "unpledged," does he represent his own view? Surely not. Does he represent those who voted for him? If so, ninety per cent. of those who voted for me are opposed to feminine suffrage. Does he represent the women who did not vote for him, and who (as in my case) denounced him publicly? Well, hardly. Why should he not say that he represents that vast mass of women, wives and mothers, who are opposed to the suffrage? Are they not worthy of representation?

One has extreme difficulty in defining just what is meant by representative government.

I stand with Judge Worthington. I should favor feminine suffrage if a majority requested it under a referendum taken by them. You have all heard a great

noise in the barnyard, but on looking it was one egg only. So with this apparently great clamor for the ballot; it is just a handful of really gifted persons.

Are women represented in the state?

Are women represented in the cabs of our locomotives? Ah, yes.

Are women represented in the wheel houses and engine rooms of our ocean liners?

Are women represented on the frontier of medicine by proper surgeons? (A woman would not care to have a woman surgeon operate on her.)

Are women represented at the front in war?

Are women represented by men on juries? Why, men give her a more liberal deal than any jury of women would give her.

Are women represented on the bench of America? They know that they are.

Are they represented in the great departments of thought and philosophy? Ah, yes.

Yes, that plain fellow, man, is there struggling for her.

Represented! When did the race become divided? When did our interests become severed? This severance of sex interest is not a reassuring political symptom.

Is not the man represented in the home? Yea, verily! and by his wife and sisters.

Is not she represented in the state? Yea, verily! and by husband and brothers.

He is represented in the home by one of superior sex morality—sex virtue—adapted to the maintenance of the home.

She is represented in the state by one of superior pecuniary contractual honor—adapted to the maintenance of the state.

All this is the divine order. Away then with these comparisons! There can be none. The race is mystically one—in the eye of Him before whom there is neither "male nor female, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free."

It is curious to observe how Lincoln seems to have said something on every question of reform, even on reforms undreamed of in his day. (Every human reform is strangely like the anti-slave movement, and hence each reformer of consequence is by analogy a Wendell Phillips or a Lucretia Mott.)

The member from Trumbull county quoted Lincoln on the suffrage movement, but I assume that the quotation may have been handed to him by a suffragette for it was far from correct. What Lincoln said was this: "I go for all sharing the privileges of the government who assist in bearing its burdens, consequently I go for admitting all whites to the right of suffrage, who pay taxes or bear arms, by no means excluding females."

These words, limiting the franchise to whites and taxpayers, are found in the New Salem Journal of June 13, 1836, and are quoted by Ida Tarbell, page 127, in her "Life of Lincoln," Miss Tarbell being an anti-suffragist.

Here was a most aristocratic view of the franchise used by the suffragists as a most democratic view.

Yes, I agree with the distinguished member from Hamilton, Judge Peck. It is no longer a joke. It is war. As the very Rev. Anna Shaw said, "It is bullets for ballots." Anyone who reads the reports from London will understand how correct Judge Peck really is

Woman's Suffrage.

about it. It is a sex war. No, no; let me not say that. It is a mere handful of women breaking windows, assaulting government ministers—a coterie whose (possible and soon) presence at the ballot box has already served to bring about a curious condition of mental obsequiousness among men, so that on the floor of this Convention we hear members vociferate “it is a perfect enigma that any man can take the other side of this question. He must have some sinister motive.”

Mr. PECK: Do you think American women would go around breaking windows?

Mr. BOWDLE: I don't know. I know what the Rev. Anna Shaw has said.

Mr. PECK: But you know that the American woman would not do that.

Mr. BOWDLE: I don't know. I know that the ladies of this country are in training with a lady who is under sentence for pulling the whiskers of the prime minister of England.

I tell you the whole movement is but part of the effeminate superficiality of this generation. This superficiality finds its consummation in the present masculine abasement now witnessed in America and here on this floor. “Women are more capable than men.” “Women are more honorable than men.” “Women live on a higher plane than men.” “Women are more moral than men.” “Women will purify the ballot.” And so on *ad nauseum*. And when an obsequious bower to women is asked whether he would care to go to war at the request of a female president or female senator, he deftly avoids the issue by saying, “Woman is greater than the soldier because she produces the soldier.” What an answer!

I say to you who approve this effeminate spirit of the age, why don't you be just and right about it, why don't you agree to turn over the government to women if they are indeed your superiors? Why not have women justices, women presidents, women senators? Ah, no; even you do not bow so obsequiously as this—your trembling knees will not kink thus far.

You assert that female suffrage will accomplish tremendous things. I deny it. It is impossible. In political and pecuniary matters women are quite as selfish as men, and, as Judge Peck admitted frankly, in the broad contractual matters of life they are really less careful.

Denver, where for twenty years women have voted for everything from president to poundmaster, is as corrupt as Philadelphia. Don't think for an instant that I blame women with this. Ah, no. I speak of it because it denies the wonderful purity and excellence of female voting. Judge Lindsey's book, “The Beast,” was written but a year ago. It tells of Colorado politics for the past ten years. And, mark you, he tells how Senatoress Alma Lafferty and the Hon. Mary Bradford, two suffragettes, stumped Colorado against him.

The fortune of a wife is now immune (for all family accounts) from the husband's creditors, but when women exercise the government function a change quickly comes over her entire status. This came some time ago in Colorado. It is evident that when women occupy these halls side by side with men—when the wife's vote may veto the husband's; when she votes for the

war which men must fight—it is evident, I say, that when this comes about her entire stage and status changes. She then becomes the pecuniary head of the house.

Here in Ohio the wife has a dower interest in every piece of real estate owned by her husband. In Colorado she has no such interest. He can sell every acre he has free from the wife's claim, save only the homestead. When she assumed the governmental function she consented to enter the arena of the individualistic struggle, where there is no sex known. The legal curtain fell from about her.

Why, when women got the ballot in Colorado it took many years for the good women to stop the outcast-woman vote. Denver has a large abandoned-woman vote. The prevailing gang used to vote them by the hackloads. It was merely another evil added to the electorate.

I stand here as the apostle of the old man—mere man—tyrannical man. The old fellow who brings home the rent—who eats out of a kettle at noon, and fills it with kindling to carry home in the evening. The old fellow who pays for the food and heat and light, who puts up the insurance premiums, and occasionally wrestles with a chattel mortgage—and who does trifling things like that. I represent the old fellow about whom little poetry is written, who buys the millinery and high-priced clothes, and theater tickets, who gets black looks when the struggle gets hard and the money short. I stand here for that common old fellow who has gallantly made a legal condition of refuge for women, who has secured for them an interest in his property so that he cannot mortgage or dispose of his own without woman's consent. The old duffer who has created a condition of refuge where she and her private fortune are immune even from creditors who have furnished her the very food she eats and Paris clothes that she wears—that old fellow, the tyrant, who has secured to her all the rights of contract enjoyed by himself, all the privileges of civil life with few of its duties or responsibilities—the old codger who furnishes the world with a meal ticket, who struggles on amid a harsh civilization while multitudes of “her” parade our streets, wearing beautiful clothing. I stand here as the apostle of the old fellow who has hewn the wood and drawn the water, who has tunneled our mountains, who has bridged our rivers, who has built our railroads, who has endured the privations of construction camps, who has breathed the compressed air in caissons, who has united our continents by marvelous marine greyhounds, who has with infinite thought and back-breaking labor constructed the astonishing apparatus of civilization and all that is worthy and up-to-date in government, and who now stands in the presence of it all wearing plain clothes, holding up horny hands, weary in body and mind, quietly receiving the assurance that he is indeed a tyrant. That plain old fellow I stand for who has fought the bloody battles of the world, who has filled the war trenches with himself, who in times of peace and in hours of prosperity has not sought for or married duchesses or princesses of the blood, who has married American women. Yes, I represent him who has lied for and died for women, him who in America is so gallant towards her that a jury of “him” will not

Woman's Suffrage.

believe him when a woman is involved, and this though he knows full well that in court and out of it she is quite as capable of dissimulation as himself.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: I move that his time be extended ten minutes longer.

The motion was carried.

Mr. BOWDLE: I thank you, gentlemen, and I am thankful that the motion came from a reliable dry.

Let me give you a picture of a true woman, as she existed in Solomon's day, and lasted down to the days of our own mothers.

Solomon says:

"Who can find a helpful woman, for her price is far above rubies."

"The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her, so that he shall have no need of spoil."

"She will do him good, and not evil, all the days of her life."

"She seeketh wool and flax and worketh diligently with her hands."

"She riseth also while it is yet DARK and giveth meat to her household and a portion to her maidens."

"She considereth a field and buyeth it; with the fruit of her hands she planteth a vineyard."

TO THE POOR.

"She perceiveth that her merchandise is good; her candle goeth out by night."

"She stretcheth out her hands to the poor; yea, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy."

"She layeth her hands to the spindle and her fingers hold the distaff."

"Her husband is known in the gates, where he sitteth among the elders of the land."

"She openeth her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue is the law of kindness."

"She looketh well to the ways of her household, and she eateth not the bread of idleness."

"Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her."

"She layeth her hands to the spindle and her fingers hold the distaff." Not a bit of it; she layeth hold of a brick and assaulteth the prime minister. "She looketh well to her household." Not a bit of it; she reacheth for the home secretary and pulleth his whiskers. "Her husband is known in the gates." Forget it. He is the mollycoddle of the community, and doeth the housework. He spendeth his leisure hours telling of her superiority.

Oh, yes; the home is great and women are great, and our homes were great, yes greater, in former days — the days of our mothers, when there was no clamor for the ballot. Is the home today as great as in former days? Gentlemen, pause! Be honest! The deplorable state of the home is the doleful sociological fact of this feverish hour, yet in spite of all, I say that if the women of America really desire the ballot they must be given it, and I should not stand in the way of their evolution. But they do not desire it now. I have done.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes the gentleman from Adams county.

Mr. STAMM: May I ask the gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. BOWDLE] just one question?

The VICE PRESIDENT: The gentleman from Adams county is recognized.

Mr. PETTIT: I had hoped that the debate on this question would pass without any cause for recrimination, but it seems that the gentleman last upon this floor is determined to rub it in on the old drys. According to his statement the other day his mother belonged to the drys — that mother who went down in the valley of the shadow of death to bring him into this world, who watched over him in his infancy and probably shaded his eyes from the light, who tucked him in bed and kissed him good night throughout all the years of his infancy, and who taught him the Lord's prayer and that other beautiful sentiment, "Now I lay me down to sleep." But when he got out to Colorado he saw a light and turned against the teachings of that good old mother. His zeal on this floor shows one thing to my mind and one alone, and it manifested itself in the asking of questions of his own associates. You will remember he asked Judge Peck, "Don't you remember there are some Germans down in Cincinnati who don't want you to vote for this?"

That seems to be the burden of this gentleman all along the line. Why, the gentleman asked so many questions that he assumed the position of an interrogation point. He reminds me of that fellow that Mark Twain wrote about in "Innocents Abroad" who asked so many questions.

Now I want to voice my sentiments in favor of this proposal and I want to remind the Convention that I was the first member on this floor who introduced a proposal of that kind. I don't know why the gentleman who returned this report didn't say something about it. It is No. 57, and I introduced it on the fifth day of the Convention. I am not piqued because he has not referred to that, but the report they have here embodies just what I want and I was the first one who introduced this proposal. I was in favor of it before I came here. I have always been in favor of woman's suffrage, and I don't think I shall ever see the time while I live that I shall not. I think, like Judge Peck, that we need women in politics to purify it. There is no doubt that wherever they appear there is purification and better morals. The atmosphere takes on a different hue. You let a crowd of men be together indulging in course jokes or obscene stories and let a woman appear and at once it is stopped. Her presence has that effect.

Some delegates on the floor have referred to the fact that they won't vote in school questions. I don't blame them. I have heard women complaining of being proscribed from voting on other things and saying that they wouldn't care to vote on school matters. Give them all the rights that belong to them and they will exercise the voting privilege.

I believe that is all have to say that I can say within the limited time accorded me. I am like my friend from Williams [Mr. JOHNSON], although I am on the other side of this question from him. I say it is an outrage that this subject has not been given more consideration by the Convention. I am willing for the opponents to have all the time they want and I want the parties in

Woman's Suffrage.

favor of it likewise to have an ample sufficiency of time to express themselves, and I have no fear of the results. I thank you for the time you have given me and I submit the question so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BIGELOW: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: I am fully aware that in these matters concerning which there is such sharp difference of opinion it is impossible to please both sides. Friends of a measure, in their enthusiasm and earnestness and great zeal, make the mistake often of questioning the motives of those who differ from them. But that is a price that a man must pay who permits himself to get into the position of a representative of people of different opinions, who feel that they have a claim upon his vote. I have already appreciated something of what that price is that a man must pay. For instance, on Monday of this week there appeared in the newspapers all over this state an alleged report of an address of mine at the Grand Opera House in Cincinnati on Sunday afternoon, to the effect that I, on that occasion, declared myself a socialist; and the next day there appeared editorials in at least two of the great newspapers of the great state of Ohio, and one of these editorials deliberately charged me with the dishonesty of concealing my socialistic opinions until, under a cloak of being something else, I had secured the position of president of this Convention, and then, after that had been secured, coming out and announcing myself something that would have defeated me for president of the Convention had the announcement been made before the election.

Now, the report that came from Cincinnati was—I was going to say a deliberate falsehood; I will say it was not true. I had, I suppose, my usual audience of about one thousand people Sunday afternoon. I have preached for those people for fifteen years. I would rather lose my life than lose their confidence; and those in that audience know I said no such thing as was reported in the papers the next day. But this is the price I must pay because they look upon me as the representative of the initiative and referendum idea in the state of Ohio, and they think if they can blacken my character they can destroy this great principle of government at the polls when it is submitted a month or two or three months from now.

So in regard to this measure, the vote I am going to cast and the position I am going to take, will cause some people to say that I deceived and took advantage of some of my constituents and that I represented myself to be one thing before the election and another after.

Let me tell you just the situation: There are two questions involved here. One of the questions is woman's suffrage itself, and the other the question of the time and manner of its submission. Now, first in regard to the question of the time and manner of its submission. When we began talking about the work of this Convention before and after election, and for a long time, nobody had any thing else in mind but that we were going to come up here and draft a new constitution, that all the things we did would be incorporated in the one instrument and that we would present this as a whole for the acceptance or rejection of the people. Now, when we all supposed that would be the situation, I took the stand in Cincinnati, and I did it in the newspapers, that

I was opposed to putting woman's suffrage in the constitution, because I believed if it were put in the constitution, and if license were put in the constitution, and if good roads went into the constitution and all these other things upon which there was more or less difference of opinion, that soon we would have enough opposition rallied to hopelessly defeat anything that we might put up to the people of the state. That was my stand, and I wrote a letter to the German American Alliance telling them my position. It was not because any of the Germans over the Rhine in Cincinnati expected me to vote against woman's suffrage because of any bearing it might have on those engaged in the liquor business. It was simply because, as I explained, if woman's suffrage were put into the constitution it would help to defeat it, and that is why I opposed it.

But this is an altogether different question. It is not proposed to put woman's suffrage in the constitution. The proposition before us is that we shall agree to separately submit this question so that it may be decided upon its merits by the electors of the state, without prejudicing in any way the rest of the work we may submit. Now, I do not see how I, as a referendum man, can refuse to cast my vote in favor of this measure going to the people, that they in their wisdom can say whether or not it shall go into the constitution. I know, my friends, there are men on this floor who are going to vote to submit this question today,—and sixty men can do it,—and yet, some of these very men will stand up and vote against the measure that is coming before them in the next two or three weeks. And what is that measure? Why, to permit four per cent. of the electors of the state, which will be forty thousand if you don't have woman's suffrage, and eighty thousand if we do—to permit forty thousand or eighty thousand, as the case may be, of the electors in the state of Ohio to offer to the legislature a constitutional amendment and ask that legislature to submit it. I say there are going to be people who will vote for this today who will stand up here and say that sixty men here will submit a constitutional amendment to the people of Ohio, but that forty thousand or eighty thousand cannot do it under the initiative and referendum.

Why, for sixty years, by holding to a three-fifths rule in a legislature it has been possible for fourteen men in the senate of Ohio to prevent the submission of a constitutional amendment to the people. And fourteen men in the Ohio senate a few years ago defeated the initiative and referendum and prevented it from going to the people. Now, you gentlemen are going to have a test of your faith in democracy. Are you going to say that sixty of you can do it, or that fourteen men may refuse it, but that forty thousand or eighty thousand of the people of Ohio can not do it?

What is going to happen reminds me of the story they tell of a man who was running for mayor of the city of Tacoma. He was charged with being a friend of the railroad magnate, Jim Hill, and he felt that he would have to clear himself of that charge, and so, before a great audience he cried out before the people. He was a great big man, portly, and had on his chin what they call out there a fine crop of spinach that covered his portly body. So he cried out to the people, and he said: "Do I look like a man whom Jim Hill could own? And there was a

Woman's Suffrage.

boy's voice in the gallery yelled out, "Oh, come out from behind them bushes."

Masks are going to be torn off here, and people who have been saying they believe in democracy and who are still voting here to apply the principles of democracy to one question and another, are going to take the stand that the people of Ohio shall not be trusted with the power to rule themselves save under such provisions as will make it virtually impossible for them to do so.

I believe in democracy. I believe in applying it to the one question as well as to the other. I believe in applying it to all questions, and therefore I can not vote "no" on submitting this question to the body of the people at this time.

On the merits of this question let me say this. That government is best which best develops in all its citizens a healthy, moral and intellectual growth. How do you make character? You increase a man's power. You increase his sense of responsibility. You increase his power and responsibility and you develop character. I say that that is the best government in the world, not that which keeps the streets cleaned, not that which lights the streets the best, not that which gives the people the most for their money, but that which most certainly and effectually develops in all its citizens, men and women alike, a capacity for intelligent self-government. And so I say, to increase the power of men and women, will be to increase their sense of responsibility, and the exercise of this power and responsibility will make them grow into better men and women.

Our republic should be made a school where citizens all their lives may be learning how best to govern themselves, and so I am glad, in spite of what anybody may say as to any representations of mine before the election, to cast my ballot in favor of this measure that it may go to the people, and that the people may say what shall be done with it at the polls.

The VICE PRESIDENT: It is now within one minute of the time fixed for voting.

Mr. BIGELOW: On account of the fact that I took more time than I expected, I move that the time be extended five minutes for Mr. Kilpatrick to close the debate.

The motion was carried.

The president here resumed the chair.

Mr. KILPATRICK: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: I want to express my sincere thanks for giving me this five minutes.

The question which we had before us yesterday and today is a serious question. It is well known that when a man has no argument on his side he always resorts to ridicule. Every single bit of blood in my veins is democratic blood, in the true sense of the term, and when I hear a man stand up before a convention of this kind, in the presence of an assembly like this, and ridicule the women of this state, the mothers of this state, then I am constrained to blush for manhood. The gentleman from Cincinnati [Mr. BOWDLE] says that I misquoted Lincoln and that Lincoln was in favor of restricted suffrage. I want to say to the gentleman from Cincinnati that Lincoln was the man through whose efforts the shackles were stricken from four million colored people in the United States, and it was the people of the United States who gave to those of that four million who had attained ma-

jority the right of suffrage, and they gave it to them without asking them whether they wanted it or not.

Were these slaves which were then enfranchised better able to take part in this government than are the great and noble women of this state and of this country? And I go further and I say this to you, that I would want my tongue to cleave to the roof of my mouth, and that I be paralyzed where I stand, before I would say anything against the womanhood of this state or nation, even though she be painted with the deepest scarlet. It was He whom you quote so many times who said, "Let him without sin cast the first stone." Mr. BOWDLE, put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Now the only thing we ask of you men is, as sincere men, as men who have fair minds, as democratic democrats, submit this proposition to the electors so we may have an expression upon this vital question, a question that is not to be ridiculed even by the great humorist from Cincinnati [Mr. BOWDLE], who has not yet reached the fame which we hope some day he will attain as being the great humorist of the Fourth Constitutional Convention. We have all had the opportunity to observe that he is trying to make that reputation.

Mr. DOTY: I demand the special order for this hour.

The demand was seconded and was carried.

The PRESIDENT: The secretary will first read the proposal as amended and then call the roll on the proposal as amended as to whether it shall be adopted.

The proposal was read.

Mr. Brown, of Highland: That tenth line was not read as it should appear. We adopted an amendment changing that word "equal."

The SECRETARY: No; the amendment substitutes "woman's" for "equal" between lines 18 and 19, but not where that word "equal" occurs in the tenth line.

Mr. DOTY: That will be taken care of in the committee on Phraseology.

The question being "Shall the proposal pass?"

The yeas and nays were taken, and resulted—yeas 76, nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Anderson,	Harbarger,	Read,
Antrim,	Harris, Ashtabula,	Redington,
Baum,	Harter, Stark,	Rockel,
Beatty, Morrow,	Henderson,	Shaffer,
Brown, Highland,	Holtz,	Shaw,
Cassidy,	Hursh,	Smith, Geauga,
Cody,	Johnson, Madison,	Smith, Hamilton,
Collett,	Jones,	Solether,
Colton,	Kehoc,	Stevens,
Crites,	Kilpatrick,	Stewart,
Crosser,	Kramer,	Stilwell,
Cunningham,	Lambert,	Taggart,
Davio,	Lampson,	Tannehill,
DeFrees,	Leete,	Tetlow,
Doty,	Longstreth,	Thomas,
Dunn,	Malin,	Ulmer,
Elson,	Marriott,	Wagner,
Fackler,	Miller, Crawford,	Walker,
Farnsworth,	Miller, Ottawa,	Watson,
Farrell,	Moore,	Weybrecht,
Fess,	Nye,	Winn,
FitzSimons,	Okey,	Wise,
Fluke,	Peck,	Woods,
Hahn,	Peters,	Mr. President.
Halenkamp,	Pettit,	
Halfhill,	Pierce,	

Woman's Suffrage,—Reference of Proposals.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Beyer,	Hoffman,	Norris,
Bowdle,	Hoskins,	Partington,
Brattain,	Johnson, Williams,	Price,
Brown, Lucas,	Kerr,	Riley,
Brown, Pike,	King,	Roehm,
Cordes,	Knight,	Stalter,
Donahay,	Kunkel,	Stamm,
Dunlap,	Leslie,	Stokes,
Earnhart,	Ludey,	Tallman,
Evans,	Marshall,	Worthington.
Fox,	Mauck,	
Harris, Hamilton,	McClelland,	

The roll call was verified.

So the proposal was passed as follows:

Proposal No. 91—Mr. Kilpatrick. To submit an amendment to article V, section 1, of the constitution.—Relative to equal suffrage.

Resolved, by the Constitutional Convention of the state of Ohio, That a proposal to amend the constitution shall be submitted to the electors to read as follows:

SECTION 1. At the time when the vote of the electors shall be taken for the adoption or rejection of any revision, alteration or amendments made to the constitution by this Convention, the following article, independently of the submission of any revision, alteration or other amendments submitted to them, shall be separately submitted to the electors in the words following, to-wit:

FOR EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

Every citizen of the United States, of the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been a resident of the state one year next preceding the election, and of the county, township or ward in which he or she resides such time as may be provided by law, shall have the qualifications of an elector and be entitled to vote at all elections.

SECTION 2. At such election a separate ballot shall be in the following form:

ELECTIVE FRANCHISE.

	For Woman's Suffrage.
	Against Woman's Suffrage.

SECTION 3. Separate ballot boxes shall be provided for the reception of such ballots.

SECTION 4. The voter shall indicate his choice by placing a crossmark within the blank space opposite the words, "For Woman's Suffrage," if he desire to vote in favor of the article above mentioned, and opposite the words, "Against Woman's Suffrage," within the blank space, if he desire to vote against the article above mentioned.

SECTION 5. If the votes for equal suffrage shall exceed the votes against equal suffrage, then the section above mentioned shall take the place of article V, section 1, of the constitution, regardless

of whether any revision, alteration or other amendments submitted to the people shall be adopted or rejected.

Under the rule the proposal was referred to the committee on Arrangement and Phraseology.

Mr. BOWDLE: I find that three or four lines of my speech were on the back of one of my pages and I forgot to read it. I desire to get them into the record now.

The PRESIDENT: By unanimous consent the gentleman can read the lines.

Mr. BOWDLE (reading): "Yet in spite of all I say, if the women of America really desire to vote, they must be given that right, and I shall not stand in the way of their evolution, but they do not desire it now."

Mr. DOTY: I apprehend that there is a feeling that when we adjourn we probably desire to adjourn for the week, and therefore I move to refer Proposal No. 4, which is on the calendar, to the committee on Liquor Traffic so that it won't appear on the calendar when we return.

The motion was carried.

Mr. DOTY: I now move that we proceed with the eighth order of business, "Reference to Committees of Proposals."

Mr. CROSSER: I would like unanimous consent to present a matter.

Mr. LAMPSON: Before I give consent, I would like to know if what the gentleman desires is simply to present a report and let it be postponed until Monday?

Mr. CROSSER: I want to make a report.

Mr. LAMPSON: You do not desire to act on it now?

Mr. DOTY: What is the point?

Mr. LAMPSON: The minority of the committee was given by the committee until Monday evening to file the minority report. If this is acted upon it virtually destroys that right.

Mr. CROSSER: I understood you were going to offer the minority report Monday evening?

Mr. LAMPSON: If we offer it at all we shall offer it Monday evening, but if your report is acted upon it will cut us out of the privilege.

Mr. DOTY: If we postpone action on this are you willing to take it up on Monday night?

Mr. LAMPSON: Yes.

The report offered by Mr. Crosser was withdrawn.

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEES OF PROPOSALS.

The following proposals on the calendar were read by their titles and referred as follows:

Proposal No. 289—Mr. Fluke. To the committee on Labor.

Proposal No. 290—Mr. King. To the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Proposal No. 291—Mr. Watson. To the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Proposal No. 292—Mr. Watson. To the committee on Taxation.

Proposal No. 293—Mr. Watson. To the committee on Taxation.

Proposal No. 294—Mr. Watson. To the committee on Taxation.

Proposal No. 295—Mr. Watson. To the committee on Taxation.

Reference of Proposals—Reports of Standing Committees—Change of Rules.

Proposal No. 296—Mr. Watson. To the committee on Taxation.

Proposal No. 297—Mr. Hoffman. To the committee on Education.

Proposal No. 298—Mr. Hoffman. To the committee on Labor.

Proposal No. 299—Mr. Brown, of Lucas. To the committee on Taxation.

Proposal No. 300—Mr. Farnsworth. To the committee on County and Township Organization.

Proposal No. 301—Mr. Kramer. To the committee on Education.

Proposal No. 302—Mr. Riley. To the committee on Legislative and Executive Departments.

Mr. PECK: I ask unanimous consent to present a report from the Judiciary committee.

The consent was given and Mr. Peck submitted the following report:

The standing committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights, to which was referred Proposal No. 174—Mr. Mauck, having had the same under consideration, reports it back and recommends its passage.

The report was agreed to. The proposal was ordered to be engrossed and read the second time in its regular order.

Mr. STOKES: I have a report.

Mr. HOSKINS: I think it is unfair to pass things when people are trying to get recognition. Mr. Fluke has been trying to get recognition on Proposal No. 289.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Well, the member from Ashland hasn't the floor then.

Mr. FLUKE: This Proposal No. 289 should be referred to the Judiciary committee, but it is referred to the committee on Labor. I would like to have the Convention pass on it.

Mr. DOTY: To bring it back where we started I move to reconsider the vote by which we referred that to the committee on Labor.

The motion was carried.

Mr. FLUKE: I now move that that proposal be referred to the Judiciary committee.

The motion was carried.

The PRESIDENT: We will now have the report of the gentleman from Montgomery [Mr. STOKES].

The report was read as follows:

The standing committee on Legislative and Executive Departments to which was referred Proposal No. 163—Mr. Miller, of Crawford, having had the same under consideration, reports it back with the following amendments, and recommends its passage when so amended:

Strike out the word "providing" in line 5 and in lieu thereof insert the word "provided."

Strike out the word "however" and the comma thereafter, in the same line.

After the word "women" in line 6 insert the following: "who are citizens, as notaries public, members of library boards, or to any position in those institutions established by the state, or by any subdivision thereof, for the exclusive care of women or children, or both."

The report was agreed to. The proposal was ordered to be engrossed and read the second time in its regular order.

Mr. FACKLER: Proposal No. 301 was referred to the committee on Education and it should have been referred to the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights. I move that Proposal No. 301 be referred to the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

The motion was carried.

Mr. KRAMER: I have no objection to the reference, but the proposal refers to general morality and education.

The PRESIDENT: The proposal has been referred to the committee on Judiciary.

Mr. MILLER, of Crawford: I move that the committee on Rules be relieved of Resolution No. 57.

The motion was carried.

Mr. DOTY: The resolution will be found on page 5 of the journal of February 1. It reads:

Resolved, That Rule No. 41 be rescinded and that a new rule 41 be adopted in lieu thereof to read as follows:

Rule 41. The hour to which the Convention shall stand adjourned from day to day, shall be seven o'clock p. m. on Mondays, one p. m. on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, and ten a. m. on Fridays. Unless otherwise ordered, no sessions shall be held on Saturday.

It ought to be apparent to the members of the Convention that under the present schedule of time we have wasted enough time without keeping it up to the end of our journey. We are about ten days behind where we ought to be if we had had sense enough to start in with that resolution the first day. There is not any person about this State House—newspaper man, member or former member, or executive official of any kind—who does not know what I say is true, and most of them will say so as well as believe it. We could just as well have had the good roads proposition out of the way in half the time we took. We could have had the liquor business out of the way a week before, we could have had the woman-suffrage business through a week ago and we could have been now where we will be a week or so from now. It seems strange that a hundred and nineteen men who can get votes enough to be elected to a place like this cannot add two and two together and make four, especially after eight or nine weeks of effort. Now what do we do? We meet at half past ten; the morning is broken up, for really we don't know whether we are going to meet at half-past ten or nine or eleven or any other time. A committee meeting is set for nine o'clock. Well, a good deal of time is wasted in getting the committee together and then we are limited; the Convention meets anywhere from nine to half-past ten, so that we cannot practically have any committee meetings in the morning. That leaves us only two nights in the week to do committee work. What is the result? Every member tries to be in three places at one time, and most of them spend half their time scooting up and down the hall trying to be here, there and everywhere at the same time. Now just look at the condition today. Who here is not ready to go home and

Change of Rules.

who hasn't his bag packed right now to run for the train? I have; I am going at three o'clock.

Several DELEGATES: We have not got our bags packed.

Mr. DOTY: Then it is because you haven't got bags. That only gives two nights for committee work. We spend all of the day talking about things here in Convention when we ought to be doing our work in committees, and we have wasted time nearly every day that we have been in session. If this rule is adopted, of course, under it we would meet tomorrow, but that can easily be taken care of by motion to adjourn until Monday evening and begin the Friday sessions next week. If we keep on the way we are doing now we will be here next September, and nobody is to blame but the Convention. You can go home from the Convention and tell your people what fine workers we are, but if they will take the record and call your attention to the time we have wasted, and we have done it ourselves, there won't be any answer to it. This resolution ought to pass.

Mr. STILWELL: If this is such a good rule why wait until next week for its adoption? Why not put it into effect now?

Mr. DOTY: Personally I am willing to unpack and stay, but we ought to notify the members before we start such a rule. A great many of the members have made their arrangements to go home this afternoon and have engagements at home for tomorrow, and it would be unfair to adopt this rule to go into effect immediately, although I personally am willing.

Mr. MOORE: I want to move to amend by striking out in the second line "one p. m." and insert "ten a. m."

Mr. DOTY: That is just the thing we are trying to get away from.

The PRESIDENT: The amendment has not been presented in writing under the rule and is not before the Convention.

Mr. McCLELLAND: If this rule is so good why has it lain in that committee so long?

Mr. DOTY: I am on the Rules committee. Do you want me to answer?

Mr. McCLELLAND: Yes; I asked the question.

Mr. DOTY: I have been voted down six to one every time the matter was brought up.

Mr. HARRIS, of Ashtabula: I favor the passage of this resolution. I, too, recognize the fact that we occasionally have need to get into a committee to consider some of the important propositions that we have before us. Occasionally, at rare intervals, Mr. Doty and I get together by some strange fortuitous circumstance, and we have been together on this proposition from the beginning. Now I want to impress that same idea on the minds of the other one hundred and seventeen. I don't think there is any other way of doing the business. To adjourn Thursday morning simply means everybody scampers home. And from the time we leave here Thursday we don't think of anything else except trying to explain to our constituents, when they ask us, what we are doing. Convention work doesn't enter our minds until the next Monday night.

Mr. HOSKINS: I am absolutely opposed to meeting on Friday. Mr. Doty has been trying to pull the Convention into work on Friday from the very begin-

ning, but he was voted down then and he was voted down in the committee on Rules six to one.

Mr. STEVENS: I am one of the members of this Convention who has been on the floor every minute of the time since January 9 and I expect to continue to do so until the final adjournment. I wouldn't object to changing the hours so that we could meet at nine o'clock and so far as wasting any ten days is concerned I can account for more than that much time being wasted in listening to unnecessary explanations from the delegate from Cuyahoga [Mr. Doty]. I am opposed to this resolution. If we will come here and let everybody get on the floor and say what he has to say and nothing more, and not have him try to relieve himself of ideas that haven't anything to do with the matter under discussion, we will get along without meeting on Friday.

Mr. MILLER, of Crawford: I am cognizant of the fact that many members are here at a sacrifice, but I contend that they should have considered that when they consented to become candidates as delegates to this Convention.

Now a good deal has been said about economy and less living expenses and keeping the expenses within the appropriation. We are under an expense of something like \$500 a day. If you work one day more a week that will be a saving of about \$1000 a month, and the secretary tells me that with his present force he can do the work of the Convention with one more day's session. Our railroad fare is \$500 a week and if we save this one day a week and four days a month in four months we will save enough to pay for the reports. I contend that we ought at least give one day more of our time.

Mr. KING: There are two points involved in this discussion which I trust the delegates will carefully consider. First, there are important committees with bushels of proposals now before them and they ought to have an opportunity to get together and do some work on them. The time for committee work is in the forenoon. We can hold afternoon sessions from one until five or half-past five and dispose of work really faster than the way we are going now. I therefore think that part of the resolution ought to be adopted.

Now on the other end of it. By adjourning Thursday we practically lose the whole of Thursday, or at least half of it. By meeting Friday, while we may lose the Friday session just as we lose Thursday's now, we will gain the whole of Thursday's session, so that we will at least get one day's work more a week. There is absolutely no reason for requiring us to hold committee meetings until midnight, unless it is for some very important and pressing matter. We ought to have the morning for committee work, and I hope the resolution will pass.

Mr. EVANS: I hope you will have no Friday session. I am opposed to it. We agreed to come here and do three days work. Mr. Doty can get home at any time, but if you meet a few minutes Friday morning it means I have to stay here until Friday night, and I don't want to stay over here Friday, Saturday and Sunday in Columbus; it is not attractive enough for me.

Vice President Fess here took the chair.

Mr. BIGELOW: No doubt there are members here whose business makes their absence on Friday oftentimes imperative. In view of that, if we desire to

Change of Rules—Historian and Reference Librarian.

change the rule, those members can get leave of absence. Possibly the attendance Friday morning will be lighter than ordinary, but nobody with an important measure would think of bringing it to a vote on Friday morning. And so if this rule is changed so that members occasionally find it necessary to be absent, he would not lose any opportunity to take part in matters of great importance. I believe if we adjourn with our work completed in thirty days, we will increase the good will of the Convention among the people by one hundred thousand votes, and I hope it can be done.

Mr. EARNHART: There are about thirty farmers in this Convention who have just as good a right to want their time at home at the end of this Convention as the lawyers in this Convention want one day a week now. I tell you, we know that when the sun begins to shine and the birds begin to sing the farmers want to be at home, but they are going to stay here until the work is done, yet we want the work done just as soon as possible to keep down the expense.

The president resumed the chair.

Mr. FESS: I believe we couldn't do anything that would create a more favorable impression with the people at large than to convince them that we are not soldiering here, but we are here to attend to business. I hope we can extend this time at least one day.

Mr. STOKES: This is entirely in accord with the motion I made on February 1, and I am glad it is going to be righted now, although it took a long time to do it. I don't think we should have wasted time adjourning Thursday from the beginning, and I hope this resolution will be passed now.

Mr. TALLMAN: Lawyers represent interests other than their own. The lawyers came here and there has been an understanding that they would have Friday and Saturday to attend to their own business, but with the understanding that there are going to be no important measures voted on Saturday, and that we can get a leave of absence if we have a trial or something coming off, I am in favor of it.

Mr. ANDERSON: I am one of the members who are listed as lawyers, and I find that Friday and Saturday are not any good to me in the practice of the law, and therefore I am with the farmers—the quicker you can get through so we can give our whole time to the practice of the law the better—and, therefore, I am with the farmers—the quicker you can get through so that we can give our whole time to the practice of law, the better I am satisfied, and I hope we will meet Fridays until we have finished.

Mr. MILLER, of Ottawa: I am glad the lawyers are getting around to the point where the farmers were when the rules were adopted. We have always been for work. It will soon be corn-planting time and when the first warm day comes the farmers are going to get nervous.

Mr. HOSKINS: I can not hear all this bluff of the farmers wanting to work without resenting it. There is not one of the thirty or thirty-five farmers here who will take hold of a corn-plow this spring. This man at my left [the gentleman from Guernsey] is simply a bluff. I don't think he ever had a plow in his hand. My friend over there from Warren [Mr. EARNHART] is honest, and he won't say that he will put his hand to

the plow. The farmers in this Convention don't do the actual work, and I hate to sit here quietly and hear them making the bluff that they do.

Mr. WATSON: As to the gentleman from Guernsey's [himself] being a bluff, I will lay my salary that the gentleman [Mr. HOSKINS] will see these hands holding a plow if he comes around at the right time of the year.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Williams: In all the excitement about the farmers, I don't see why they are trying to get away from the morning session of an hour and a half. I am ready to come here Monday morning and stay here until Saturday night, and fight it out on those lines if it takes all summer.

Mr. READ: I am heartily in favor of the resolution except that Friday meeting. We ought to have more time for committee work, and I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Auglaize [Mr. HOSKINS] that we are here to do this work. That is the main idea, whether it takes one month or six months.

Mr. HARRIS of Ashtabula: I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were taken, and resulted—yeas 82, nays 21, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Anderson,	Fox,	Miller, Crawford,
Antrim,	Hahn,	Miller, Ottawa,
Baum,	Halenkamp,	Moore,
Beatty, Morrow,	Harbarger,	Nye,
Beyer,	Harris, Ashtabula,	Okey,
Bowdle,	Harris, Hamilton,	Peters,
Brown, Highland,	Henderson,	Pierce,
Brown, Pike,	Hoffman,	Price,
Cassidy,	Holtz,	Riley,
Cody,	Hursh,	Rockel,
Collett,	Johnson, Madison,	Roehm,
Colton,	Jones,	Smith, Geauga,
Crites,	Kehoe,	Solether,
Cunningham,	Kerr,	Stewart,
Davio,	Kilpatrick,	Stilwell,
DeFrees,	King,	Stokes,
Donahey,	Knight,	Taggart,
Doty,	Kramer,	Tallman,
Dunlap,	Kunkel,	Tannehill,
Dunn,	Lambert,	Tetlow,
Earnhart,	Lampson,	Thomas,
Elson,	Leete,	Ulmer,
Fackler,	Longstreth,	Watson,
Farnsworth,	Ludey,	Woods,
Farrell,	Marriott,	Worthington,
Fess,	Marshall,	Mr. President.
FitzSimons,	Mauck,	
Fluke,	McClelland,	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Cordés,	Leslie,	Shaffer,
Crosser,	Malin,	Shaw,
Evans,	Norris,	Stalter,
Halfhill,	Partington,	Stevens,
Harter, Stark,	Peck,	Walker,
Hoskins,	Read,	Weybrecht,
Johnson, Williams,	Redington,	Wise.

So the resolution was adopted.

Mr. LEETE: I ask unanimous consent to present a report from the Rules committee.

The report was read as follows:

The standing committee on Rules, to which was referred Resolution No. 54—Mr. Leete, having had the same under consideration, reports it back without recommendation.

Historian and Reference Librarian—Petitions and Memorials.

Mr. LAMPSON: The fact that the resolution is reported back without recommendation is not to be taken to the prejudice of the resolution. The committee simply felt upon this question that Mr. Evans being a delegate, we would submit it to the Convention without recommendation.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the adoption of the resolution. Those in favor will say aye—

Mr. WORTHINGTON: I rise to a point of order. The roll should be called on that.

The PRESIDENT: The president rules that no expenditure is required by the resolution, but if the member insists the yeas and nays will be called.

Mr. WORTHINGTON: Doesn't it call for the appointment of the stenographer? It necessarily takes one from other duties.

The PRESIDENT: If the member insists the roll will be called.

The question being "Shall the resolution be adopted?"

The yeas and nays were taken, and resulted—yeas 58, nays, 29 as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Anderson,	Harris, Hamilton,	Nye,
Antrim,	Harter, Stark,	Partington,
Baum,	Hoskins,	Peters,
Beatty, Morrow,	Hursh,	Pierce,
Beyer,	Johnson, Madison,	Read,
Brown, Highland,	Jones,	Redington,
Brown, Pike,	Kehoe,	Riley,
Colton,	Kerr,	Rockel,
Cunningham,	King,	Smith, Geauga,
DeFrees,	Kramer,	Solether,
Donahy,	Lambert,	Stevens,
Dunn,	Lampson,	Stewart,
Earnhart,	Leete,	Stilwell,
Elson,	Longstreth,	Stokes,
Farnsworth,	Ludey,	Tallman,
Fess,	Marriott,	Tetlow,
Fluke,	Mauck,	Walker,
Hahn,	Miller, Crawford,	Weybrecht,
Halfhill,	Miller, Ottawa,	
Harris, Ashtabula,	Norris,	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Brattain,	Fox,	Okey,
Cassidy,	Halenkamp,	Price,
Collett,	Harbarger,	Roehm,
Crites,	Hoffman,	Stalter,
Davio,	Johnson, Williams,	Taggart,
Doty,	Kunkel,	Ulmer,
Dunlap,	Leslie,	Watson,
Fackler,	Malin,	Woods,
Farrell,	Marshall,	Worthington.
FitzSimons,	Moore,	

The PRESIDENT: So the resolution is lost.

Mr. LEETE: Why, it carried by 58 to 29.

The PRESIDENT: The resolution was lost. It did not receive the constitutional majority.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

On motion the Convention then adjourned until Monday evening at seven o'clock.

Mr. Antrim presented the petition of Tobias Miller and seventy other citizens from different towns, asking for the submission of a measure providing for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Anderson presented the petition of Mary E. Ever-

hart and three hundred twenty-two other citizens of Mahoning and Trumbull counties asking for the submission of a measure providing for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Baum presented the petition of Chas. Timberlake and one hundred sixty-nine other citizens of Ross county, asking for the submission of an amendment to the constitution providing for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Beyer presented the petition of two hundred fifty-two citizens of Hancock county, asking for the submission of a woman suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Bowdle presented the petition of Henry A. Weeks and twenty-four other citizens of Hamilton county, protesting against a license clause in the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bowdle presented the petition of O. L. Seward and seventy-three other citizens of Cincinnati, asking for full suffrage of women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Brattain presented the petition of James J. Miller and seventy-three other citizens of Paulding, relating to full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Beatty of Morrow, presented the petition of Mrs. R. A. Sheldon and seventy-three other citizens of Morrow county, asking for the submission of a woman's suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Brown, of Highland, presented the petition of Harriett Irwin and eighty-eight other citizens of Highland county, asking for the submission of a measure providing full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Cunningham presented the petitions of Mrs. W. E. Cunningham and sixty-two other citizens of Harrison county; of Anna K. Dunlap and twenty-eight other citizens of Harrison county, asking for woman's suffrage; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Cassidy presented the petition of W. S. Culp and one hundred twenty-four other citizens of Logan county, favoring the submission of an amendment granting woman suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Colton presented the petition of Mrs. D. W. Besaw and three hundred eighty-six other citizens of Portage county, for the submission of a woman suffrage amendment; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Doty presented the petition of Cleveland city council, of Cleveland, petitioning the abolition of capital punishment, except as a punishment for treason; which was referred to the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Mr. Doty presented the petition of Clemens A. Rosing and one hundred forty-five other citizens of Cleveland, requesting constitutional provision so that owners of mortgaged property may be taxed only on the equity

Petitions and Memorials.

they possess in such property; which was referred to the committee on Taxation.

Mr. Dwyer presented the petition of the city council, of Dayton, relative to home rule; which was referred to the committee on Municipal Government.

Mr. Dwyer presented the petition of H. M. Myers and sixty-two other citizens of Montgomery county, asking for the submission of an equal suffrage proposal; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. DeFrees presented the petition of Mattie Whitmer and one hundred three other citizens of Miami county, to submit a measure providing for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Fox presented the petition of C. J. Young and seventy-three other citizens of Celina, asking for the submission of a measure providing for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Fox presented the petition of the Rev. D. R. Lusk and fifty-five other citizens of Mercer county, protesting against licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Fluke presented the petition of Wm. Kershner and two hundred thirty-nine other citizens of Ashland county, asking for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Evans presented the petition of four hundred thirty-three citizens of Scioto county, asking for the submission of a woman suffrage amendment; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Earnhart presented the petition of Mrs. George Sellers and twenty-five other citizens of Springboro, asking the favorable consideration of the proposal for woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Harter, of Stark, presented the petition of four hundred thirty-five citizens from Stark county, asking for the submission of a woman suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Hoskins presented the petition of J. L. Klinger and one hundred forty-three other citizens of Auglaize county, asking for the submission of a measure providing full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Harris, of Ashtabula, presented the petition of Mrs. Agnes Hart and three hundred eighty-four other citizens of Ashtabula county, asking for the submission of a separate proposal for equal suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Holtz presented the petition of Bertha Hanson and one hundred thirty-eight other citizens of Seneca county, asking for the submission of a woman suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petitions of Mrs. W. H. Darby and fifty-four other citizens of Allen county; of the Hon. Chas W. Johnston and sixty-five other citizens

of Harrod; of Mrs. Mary Parker and seventy-three other citizens of Allen county, asking for submission of a woman's suffrage amendment to voters; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Kunkel presented the petition of D. M. King and four hundred ninety-two other citizens of Muskingum county, requesting suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. King presented the petitions of Mrs. T. C. Hamilton and thirty-one other citizens of Kelleys Island; of Nina Goodwin and ninety-five other citizens of Sandusky county, favoring equal suffrage; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Kramer presented the petition of J. H. McEl-Hinney and one hundred ninety-four other citizens of Richland county, asking for the submission of a woman's suffrage amendment to the voters of the state; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Kerr presented the petition of Clarence J. Davis and two hundred seven other citizens of Jefferson county, asking for favorable consideration of the proposal favoring woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Mauck presented the petitions of Mrs. Gladys Carpenter Bovie and thirty-two other citizens of Gallia county; of Mabel Butcher and thirty-nine other citizens of Cheshire; of C. W. Ely and thirty-five other citizens of Gallia county, in behalf of full suffrage for women; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Kilpatrick presented the petition of one hundred four citizens of Cuyahoga, Guernsey, Noble and Greene counties, asking for the submission of a woman's suffrage amendment to the voters of the state; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Lambert presented the petition of two hundred eighty-six citizens of Jackson county, requesting equal suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Leete presented the petition of four hundred fifty-six citizens of Lawrence county, asking for the submission of a woman's suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Longstreth presented the petition of Mrs. Mary Loomis and sixty-eight other citizens of Ohio, asking the Convention to submit a measure providing for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Kehoe presented the petition of Sadia Miller and four hundred twelve other citizens of Brown county, asking for the submission, to the voters of the state, of a measure providing for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. McClelland presented the petition of Wm. Miller and one hundred fifty other citizens of Knox county, in favor of equal suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Petitions and Memorials.

Mr. Miller, of Crawford, presented the petition of Lawrence E. Ames and eighty-two other citizens of Crawford county, requesting woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Marshall presented the petition of William Hill and one hundred other citizens of Coshocton county, asking for the submission of woman's suffrage to the voters of the state; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Norris presented the petitions of Mrs. Maggie Griffith and twenty-one other citizens of Marion county; of R. F. Brown and sixty-five other citizens of Marion county, favoring equal suffrage for women; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Okey presented the petition of Cyrus Belford and eighty other citizens of Noble county, asking for the submission of an amendment to the constitution granting suffrage to women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Malin presented the petition of Mrs. Mollie L. Sandburg and three hundred fifty-five other citizens of Lake county, in favor of woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Doty presented the memorial of the First Presbyterian church of Cleveland, congratulating the Convention on defeat of the King license proposal and commending the vote of delegates Fackler and Stilwell thereon; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Wagner presented the petitions of W. Underwood and forty-two other citizens of Union City; of L. E. Chenoweth and seventy-two other citizens of Darke county; of H. Z. Silver and sixty-seven other citizens of Darke county; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Watson presented the petitions of Mrs. H. B. Zoller and fifty-four other citizens of Guernsey county; of J. W. Hill and sixty-five other citizens of Guernsey county, relative to woman's suffrage; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Stamm presented the petition of Addie Chambers and forty-five other citizens of Clyde, asking for the submission of a measure, to the voters, providing for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Knight presented the petition of six hundred thirty-three citizens of Franklin county, asking for the submission of a woman suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Knight presented the petitions of Alice Dunlap and fifty-nine other women citizens of Franklin county, of Ann Eliza D. Hamilton and fifteen other women citizens of Franklin county; of A. C. Green and eighteen other citizens of Franklin county; of W. H. Mikesell and six other citizens of Franklin county; of Dora Sandoe Bachman and eighty-one other women citizens of Columbus; of Helen Henderson Butler and ten other women citizens of Franklin county; of Margaret A. Eylar and thirty-eight other women citizens of Franklin

county; of E. L. DeWitt and seven other citizens of Franklin county; of C. S. Duncan and forty-two other citizens of Franklin county; of O. B. Gawcett and six other citizens of Franklin county; of W. E. Battenfield and fifteen other citizens of Franklin county; of Mrs. Edward Orton, Jr., and seventeen other women citizen of Franklin county; of R. T. Clark and twenty-four other citizens of Franklin county; of Chas. T. Lentz and other citizens of Columbus; of Elizabeth Campbell Taylor and eight other women citizens of Columbus; of Mrs. Madison Whiteside and seven other women citizens of Columbus; of Mary Horton King and twenty-two other citizens of Columbus; of Chas. F. Jenkins and fifty other citizens of Columbus; of Wm. W. King and forty-four other citizens of Columbus; of J. V. Denney and seventeen other citizens of Columbus, of Julia Gill and fifty-nine other citizens of Columbus, asking for the submission of a woman suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Collett presented the petition of three hundred fifty-two citizens of Clinton county, asking for the submission of a measure providing the right of suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Johnson, of Madison, presented the petition of T. S. Cooper and one hundred ninety other citizens of Madison county, requesting that a separate submission be made for woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Jones presented the petition of Mrs. T. L. Haas and one hundred thirty women citizens of Fayette county, asking for the submission to the electors of the state, of an amendment to the constitution granting full and equal suffrage to women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Ludey presented the petition of forty-seven citizens of Monroe county, asking for the submission of a woman's suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Tallman presented the petition of three hundred sixteen citizens of Belmont county, asking for the submission of an amendment granting the right of suffrage to women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Tetlow presented the petition of Rachel C. Shively and three hundred ninety-nine citizens of Columbiana county, asking for the submission of a woman's suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Taggart presented the petition of J. W. Dowds and five hundred sixty-five other citizens of Wayne county, asking for the submission of a woman's suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Stalter presented the petition of one hundred thirty-three citizens of Wyandot county, asking for the submission of woman's suffrage amendment to the voters of Ohio; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Thomas presented the petitions of John W. Boyce

Petitions and Memorials.

and one hundred twenty-five other citizens of Alliance; of John Schnitzler and one hundred sixty other citizens of Fostoria; of Roy Houp and one hundred other citizens of Athens; of Arthur Decker and one hundred other citizens of McGuffey; of Chas. Jerger and two hundred other citizens of Martins Ferry; of John Shaffer and one hundred other citizens of Springfield; of John H. Hoffman and thirty other citizens of West Austintown; relative to the bill of rights; which were referred to the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Mr. Smith, of Hamilton, presented the petitions of the Advent Woman's club, of Cincinnati; of the S. L. K. Mother's club, of Cincinnati; of the Civic League, of Cincinnati; and other citizens of Hamilton county, of the Social Workers' Union, of Cincinnati, numbering two hundred ninety-one persons, asking for woman's suffrage; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Smith, of Geauga, presented the petitions of H. W. Cowle and forty-eight other citizens of Burton; of Mrs. H. A. Herrick and forty-seven other citizens of Geauga county, asking for the submission of a measure providing for full suffrage for women; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Redington presented the petitions of Ida L. Jaycox and one hundred other citizens of Lorain; of Lawrence Bohl and forty-seven other citizens of Lorain; of Mrs. Ida Vincent and eighty-eight other citizens of Lorain; of C. R. Newton and forty-two other citizens of Lorain; of Mrs. A. F. Noyes and eighty-seven other citizens of Lorain county; of A. B. Wolfe and three hundred ninety-five other citizens of Lorain county, asking for the submission of an amendment to the constitution providing for woman's suffrage; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Riley presented the petitions of A. J. Lockard and fifty other citizens of Washington county; of Alice Adams and fifty-eight other citizens of Macksburg; of Mrs. Minnie Hassinger and forty-three other citizens of Washington county, asking for full suffrage for women; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Smith, of Geauga, presented the petition of Newbury Grange No. 1559 of Geauga county, in regard to taxation and other matters; which was referred to the committee on Taxation.

Mr. Smith, of Geauga, presented the petitions of Montville Grange No. 666 and No. 110, regarding the classification of property for taxation; which were referred to the committee on Taxation.

Mr. Woods presented the petition of H. Samuel Fritsch and eighty-eight other citizens of Medina county, asking for suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Winn presented the petition of G. A. Thompson and three hundred seventy-six other citizens of Defiance county, praying for equal suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Peters presented the remonstrance of Hamilton Grange No. 436, with a membership of one hundred persons and other citizens of Groveport, protesting against licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Walker presented the petition of Geo. U. Duer and seventy-three other citizens of Holmes county, asking for submission of woman's suffrage proposition to the people; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Shaw presented the petition of Mrs. W. H. Wood and fifty-eight other citizens of Spencerville, asking for full suffrage for women; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Solether presented the petition of J. O. Rhodes and fifteen other citizens of North Baltimore, asking for a prohibition clause, either state wide, or one excepting cities of 100,000 population or over; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Wm. Krebs and four other citizens of Lorain; of J. Royer and four other citizens of Summit county; of Chas. W. Smith and nine other citizens of Cuyahoga county; of J. S. Hedges and eight other citizens of Lucas county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of the Rev. J. F. Olmstead and other citizens of Columbus, members of the Seventh-Day Adventist church, of Columbus, protesting against licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Chas. Wachman and six other citizens of Stark county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. King presented the petition of Geo. W. Goodrich and ten other citizens of Erie county, asking for the passage of woman's suffrage amendment to the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Marriott presented the petition of the M. E. Sunday school, of Delaware county, opposing unrestricted license; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Marriott presented the petition of Mrs. Dr. Jones and fifty other citizens of Delaware county, favoring woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. King presented the petitions of Alice K. Hertlein and fifty-one other citizens of Sandusky, favoring women suffrage; of the 20th Century Club, and other citizens of Erie county, favoring women suffrage; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Weybrecht presented the petition of E. G. Crow and forty-nine other citizens of Limaville, protesting against the submission of Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bowdle presented the petition of M. X. Davis and twenty other citizens of Hamilton county, favoring equal suffrage for women; which was referred to

Petitions and Memorials.

the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Doty presented the petitions of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Lodge No. 11, of Cleveland; of the Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, Local No. 129, of Cleveland; of the

United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Steam Fitters' Helpers, Local Union No. 55 of Cleveland; endorsing Proposal No. 2; which were referred to the committee on Initiative and Referendum.

On motion the Convention then adjourned until Monday evening at seven o'clock.