

THIRTEENTH DAY

MORNING SESSION.

THURSDAY, February 1, 1912.

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment, was called to order by the president, and opened with prayer by the member from Knox [Mr. McCLELLAND].

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

RESOLUTIONS LAID OVER.

Resolution No. 53—Mr. Eby, was taken up.
The resolution was read as follows:

Resolved, that the president of this Convention extend to ex-President Theodore Roosevelt an invitation to address this Convention at his earliest convenience.

Mr. EBY: I move the adoption of this resolution.
The resolution was adopted.

Resolution No. 54—Mr. Leete, was taken up.
The resolution was read as follows:

Resolved, That Nelson W. Evans, delegate from Scioto county, be and is hereby appointed historian and reference librarian of this Convention, to serve without compensation.

As such it shall be his duty to obtain and preserve all data in regard to this Convention and its members as would be desired in the future.

As reference librarian, it shall be his duty to obtain and furnish to the members of this Convention and its officers, all information they may require as to any subjects germane to their duties in the preparation of the constitution.

He shall be furnished with a clerk by the secretary who shall be a stenographer and when not engaged by him shall work for the Convention.

Mr. KNIGHT: This resolution contemplates a new officer of the Convention, not provided for in the present rules of the Convention. It seems to me it should be referred to the committee on Rules. I, therefore, move that it be referred to the committee on Rules.

Mr. DOTY: I second the motion.
The motion was carried.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. LAMPSON: I make the following report of the standing committee on Good Roads:
The report was read as follows:

The standing committee on Good Roads, to which was referred Proposal No. 118—Mr. Lampson, having had the same under consideration, reports it back with the following amendments, and recommends its adoption when so amended:

Strike out the word "for" in line thirteen, and add the words "for this purpose" at the end of line eighteen.

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

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEES OF PROPOSALS.

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

Proposal No. 176—Mr. Riley. To the committee on Agriculture.

Proposal No. 177—Mr. Read. To the committee on Legislative and Executive Departments.

Proposal No. 178—Mr. Wise. To the committee on the Whole.

Proposal No. 179.—Mr. Okey. To the committee on County and Township Organization.

Proposal No. 180.—Mr. Moore. To the committee on County and Township Organization.

Proposal*No. 181—Mr. Stewart. To the committee on Taxation.

Proposal No. 182—Mr. Norris. To the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Proposal No. 183—Mr. Harris, of Hamilton. To the committee on Education.

Proposal No. 184—Mr. Peck. To the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Proposal No. 185—Mr. Watson. To the committee on Initiative and Referendum.

Proposal No. 186—Mr. Watson. To the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Proposal No. 187—Mr. Watson. To the committee of the Whole.

Proposal No. 188—Mr. King. To the committee on County and Township Organization.

Proposal No. 189—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Legislative and Executive Departments.

Proposal No. 190—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Labor.

Proposal No. 191—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Legislative and Executive Departments.

Proposal No. 192—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Proposal No. 193—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Legislative and Executive Departments.

Proposal No. 194—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Legislative and Executive Departments.

Proposal No. 195—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Corporations other than Municipal.

Proposal No. 196—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Taxation.

Proposal No. 197—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Taxation.

Proposal No. 198—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Banks and Banking.

Proposal No. 199—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Proposal No. 200—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Reference of Proposals, Etc.—Publication of Debates.

Proposal No. 201—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Proposal No. 202—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Proposal No. 203—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Education.

Proposal No. 204—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Education.

Proposal No. 205—Mr. Hahn. To the committee on Short Ballot.

Proposal No. 206—Mr. Fackler. To the committee on Short Ballot.

Proposal No. 207—Mr. Fackler. To the committee on Short Ballot.

Proposal No. 208—Mr. Fackler. To the committee on Short Ballot.

Proposal No. 209—Mr. Tetlow. To the committee on Labor.

Mr. DOTY: I will call up at this time Resolution No. 35.

Mr. NYE: Before we leave this subject, I would like to call your attention to Resolution No. 36, relative to workmen's compensation, which was referred to the Judiciary and Bill of Rights committee, and it has been suggested that it should go to the committee on Labor, and I am willing that it should go there. I therefore move that it be withdrawn from the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights and referred to the committee on Labor.

Mr. DOTY: I would like to hear from the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

The PRESIDENT: A motion will be in order later, but if there is no objection a motion will be considered at this time. The motion is to relieve the Judiciary and Bill of Rights committee of Resolution No. 36.

The motion was carried.

Mr. HALFHILL: I would like the unanimous consent to present a resolution at this time.

Mr. DOTY: Mr. President: I will withdraw my request for Resolution No. 35 for one moment.

Mr. HALFHILL: I offer a resolution.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolution No. 55:

WHEREAS, Judge Dennis Dwyer, who presided as temporary chairman of this Convention, will reach the eighty-second milestone of his life journey on tomorrow, February 2, 1912;

Be it resolved, As a tribute of respect to the oldest delegate in this Convention and as a mark of our esteem and affection for the man and the virtues that have distinguished his career, that we congratulate Judge Dwyer in his possession of rugged bodily health and unimpaired mental powers, and we wish him many added years to enjoy life's blessings, and make longer his record of usefulness to his fellowmen.

Mr. HALFHILL: I move that the rules be suspended and that the resolution be now adopted.

Mr. STOKES: I second the motion, but before the question is put, I wish to express my full sentiment in accord with the resolution, and to say that in Montgomery county, in all walks of life, no one stands higher than the venerable gentleman.

Mr. HALFHILL: I would like to add a word to that resolution, that we consider Judge Dwyer in the northwestern portion of the state as one of our institutions, of which we are deeply proud. He is known throughout the length of the Maumee Valley, and he remembers when that valley extended by name from Lake Erie to the Ohio river. When he was a boy or a young man in the northwestern portion of Ohio, even the broad Maumee was called the Miami of the lakes. We appreciate Judge Dwyer in our community. He knew all the older generations that are gone, and it is remarkable to me that a man who inquires about his friends in Northwestern Ohio—those friends a majority of whom are gone—that he still retains his faculties, and still is up with the times in all of these present ideas that we are discussing, and who has a grasp on modern day affairs. We appreciate him throughout the length and breadth of Northwestern Ohio, and therefore I present this resolution.

The PRESIDENT: The President has a very great respect and veneration for the temporary chairman of this Convention, and it is a temptation to overstep the proprieties and make a speech from the president's stand.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. DWYER: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: I thank you all for your splendid greetings to me, and I certainly appreciate this more than anything in my life.

The PRESIDENT: The question is in regard to Resolution No. 35.

Mr. DOTY: If you will send me the resolution, I will explain what the amendment is that is pending. We take up the question of whether the debates shall be printed in any form, and without going into that part of the resolution, which may be amended by subsequent amendments, the amendment is this: It proposes that whatever contract the select committee may decide upon that contract shall be reported to this Convention for approval before it is a binding contract. The amendment reads: "And such contract shall not be binding upon this Convention," etc. That is all this particular amendment does, and I think that will be a response to the criticism from the member from Wyandot. The committee wants to follow the instructions of the house, and wants to get the instruction to meet the approbation of as many as possible.

Mr. KING: It seems to me that the language of that amendment has been rather unfortunately chosen. The original resolution authorizes this committee to enter into a contract. This amendment recognizes that contract, and requires it to be reported to the Convention. A contract is an agreement between two or more minds. Now, if they make a contract will they be bound by it if the Convention does not ratify it? It would seem to me that the amendment, if I understand it, was that the contract itself is to be passed upon by the Convention—simply record the submission of the proposals, and when submitted to the Convention determine whether the contract should be made upon this basis or not—upon the basis of any one of these proposals, and I don't think the amendment ought to be adopted in that form.

Mr. LAMPSON: Mr. President: I would like to ask a question. If you insert the word "tentative"

Publication of Debates.

before the word "contract," would it meet the approval of the committee—would that be all right? Would it meet the approval of all?

Mr. KING: What I want to get at is the right of the Convention to pass upon the subject matter of the contract before it is entered into?

Mr. DOTY: Of course, the criticism of the member from Erie is well taken. I will state that the amendment offered has started some hostility. As a member of the Convention and a member of the committee, and as offering the amendment, I would like and expect that the members of this Convention will state what they want, and I will be glad to withdraw my amendment and take his, and will be glad to insert any words, provided only that we understand it and say what we want to do.

Mr. JONES: This question has been bothering me, and I suppose it has been bothering some of the other members of the Convention. I take it that a great majority of the members of this Convention are in favor of both reporting and publishing the proceedings and debates; there may be much after we get started, and there is no telling where it may end and what it will amount to. Now, we ought to be careful and in dealing with a matter of this kind we should deal with it just exactly as three or four or five men having in charge a business would do if they were dealing with it for themselves.

Now, what would we do if we had this proposition of the expenditure of \$20,000, or \$30,000 or more, on some business proposition? We would not only undertake to get at the estimate of the details with regard to any arrangement that was to be made in regard to it, but we would select some one to ascertain what could be done and what was practical to do with regard to the proposition, and then present to us some proposition with regard to the cost of it. We would want first to consider the means by which the matter was going to be accomplished and also consider anything that is incident to the contract that was to be entered into with regard to it. That same thing should be done here. When you make a contract submit it to us, both with reference to means and the manner of doing it and the cost or the probable cost of it. You should also give us the data from which we can determine with approximate accuracy the reasonable cost of the same.

Now, it occurs to me that this matter, if an estimate of this is made clearly, should be received as a report with reference to the printing of these debates—that these reports ought to be transcribed and published daily—and the other proposition that the reports ought to be printed in permanent form. Now it occurs to me the next thing from a business standpoint is for the committee to ascertain and return a statement to us based upon these three things: First, the cost of taking these stenographic notes and transcribing them; second, the cost of printing these matters daily, and third, the cost of printing in permanent form. If this information is furnished to this Convention we could get some idea of the situation and could at least act upon it, but we don't want to authorize the committee to make a contract and then undertake to unmake what they have made. I submit again that possibly the practical way to do this thing is for this committee to submit proposals from competent, reliable parties, who shall be required to give

sufficient security for the performance of any contract that may be made.

Mr. DOTY: Of course, what the member has said we most all agree to as a matter of business; but isn't it a fact that when this committee brings in any proposal or makes any proposition that this Convention must take some action as to what kind of proposition they want to make?

Mr. JONES: I think this amendment to the proposition which I have covers the ground that the gentleman suggests, if I may be permitted to read it. I move to amend Resolution No. 35, as follows:

Strike out all after the word "Resolved" and substitute the following:

"That the debates of this Convention be reported verbatim and printed and published daily or weekly in pamphlet form; that the select committee, composed of Messrs. Knight, Hoskins and Doty, be authorized and directed to invite competitive bidding from responsible, competent parties who shall be required to give sufficient security for the performance of any contract that may be awarded, for the following work, the bids to be submitted separately on each class of the work:

1. The reporting and transcribing of the proceedings and debates of this Convention.

2. The work of printing daily or weekly for the use of this Convention 2,500 copies of the proceedings and debates.

3. The work of printing and binding in durable form 2,500 copies of the said proceedings and debates.

And that said committee receive, open and investigate said bids and the competency and responsibility of the parties submitting the same, and report to this Convention."

Mr. HOSKINS: Just one word as to the substitute of the member from Fayette, and that is this: I understood that it was divided into three propositions, the stenographic report, to furnish a daily report and have it on the desks of the members, and to print it in final form. I have said and state still that I have no objection to the three separate submissions in different forms—statements both on the daily printing (and that would be the form that we would probably be compelled to accept debates), and upon the permanent form, which involves the daily printing for the reason that the form would be already set up and left to print in permanent form. If the resolution is broad enough to allow us to bring into it the binding, then you would have a basis to have it submitted in permanent form, and the matter would not have to be reset. If the resolution is broad enough to allow us to bring in an estimate on the daily publication and of the permanent form, including binding, I think it would be all right.

Mr. JONES: In reply to the member from Auglaize, I would say that my notion in regard to having these passed separately is this: In reference to this proposition to print the debates in final form at this time, I realize that the persons who might be awarded the contract to print these debates and proceedings for daily distribution, would have a great advantage in submitting a bid for the final publication, because at the

Publication of Debates.

time they would run off a sufficient number for the use daily of the Convention they could also run off what would be necessary to include in the final volumes. I think as a matter of economy, if these debates are ever going to be published in permanent form, they ought to be authorized at this time, because it can be done very much cheaper than it would be possible ever to do it again. Still, I do not see any need of authorizing the bid to be submitted jointly for both of these classes of the work, but a bid upon printing a certain number for daily circulation, and separate bid for the permanent publication would doubtless be made by all parties that were bidding at all upon the work. Now, with reference to the propriety of having separate bids upon this stenographic work, we should include not only the stenographic work itself, but the transcript of the notes of the stenographer. It is important to have that open for competitive bidding. It is said there are only a few reporting firms in this country that can do that. I take exceptions to that statement. Twenty-five or thirty years ago that might have been true, but today there is no end of competent stenographers who can take accurately the debates of this Convention and can transcribe correctly their notes. Among other things, I have unfortunately been engaged during my life as a stenographer. I know something of it, and something of the possibility of the earnings of a person in transcribing notes according to the usual rates. If you want a dozen sheets of testimony taken down and transcribed, and you apply that same rule to the reporting of the debates of this Convention it will run into an immense sum. There are lots of efficient stenographers that would be willing to do that work at very much less than the rates ordinarily allowed for some pieces of work, and do it just as efficiently and effectively as it is possible to get under the circumstances.

Mr. KNIGHT: I do not want to take any time except to make an explanation. I think if the resolution is adopted as proposed by the substitute it would cover the ground and nobody who wants anything done would have any reason to object to it, except the committee, because it devolves ten times as much work on them as the other, but we waive that objection. I would suggest, however, with the consent of the gentleman who introduced the substitute that he put in two words in that part of the resolution which provides for daily publication. My suggestion is that he put in the words "or weekly" after the word "daily."

My reason for that is that the cost of reporting the debates for daily publication and cost of printing them for daily distribution will be very much greater than for weekly publication and distribution, and if the gentleman will consent to insert those two words, it will enable the committee to submit the proposition asking for and soliciting competitive bids that will cover daily and weekly transcripts.

Mr. JONES: I agree to the amendment.

Mr. STALTER: I would like to ask for information as to whether we are reconsidering Resolution No. 23 as well as Resolution No. 35? There is some doubt in my mind as to what action this Convention has taken. Resolution No. 23 provides a report and the latter part of it recommends that the debates and proceedings of the Convention be published in full both daily and as

a whole in final, and Resolution No. 35 is a different resolution, and only provides for the contract. I want to ask for this information, that I may vote intelligently on the proposition submitted.

Mr. EARNHART: I should like to know before we vote on this resolution what we want. My own idea of the matter is that we don't need a daily publication nor a weekly publication. I think it is a useless expense. Why, if we get a daily publication here, before I could get it distributed down in Warren county our people would have read in the newspapers everything that was contained therein, and the people in Warren county do not want me to foist that upon them if they have to help pay that expense. I want to say further that if these debates are printed daily and a certain number laid on my desk they will go into the waste basket, because I realize, as I have said, it is a useless expenditure.

Mr. KRAMER: My own idea of the matter is I should like to see a publication of these proceedings in permanent form. One volume or set of volumes, as the case may be, should be for each member of this Convention, and having as I have a faith in the business sense and capacity of this committee which has been appointed, I am willing to leave it to them to have enough additional copies published to supply the needs of the leading libraries of the state. I am willing to leave that matter to their discretion. I think that is all we need. One thing more. The matter of economy ought to enter into our consideration. I want to say one thing further. There is no occasion for long-winded arguments on these questions as they come up. I believe I have sufficient faith in the intelligence of the members of the Convention that every matter that comes up for consideration—they have sufficient intelligence to apply their minds to it without being harangued for three or four days on the subject.

Mr. EARNHART: I want to say if we want to keep down expenses we can curtail the expenses if every gentleman when he gets up to speak gives a few concise reasons for the things he wants to discuss, and sits down and sits there until other members have had an opportunity to speak.

Mr. STALTER: I will correct my statement made a few moments ago. I meant Resolution No. 22 instead of Resolution No. 23, in the proceedings for January 23, 1912.

The PRESIDENT: The president understands that under the resolution the stenographers of the Convention are reporting these debates and that has nothing to do with this resolution.

Mr. CORDES: I move that the entire proposition in reference to publication of debates be now laid on the table.

Mr. DOTY: I rise to a point of order. I demand the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT: The question is to lay the entire matter upon the table.

Mr. STILWELL: Is it the intention not to decide the question of publication until after the close of the Convention, and in the meantime to have stenographic reports taken—is that the sense?

Mr. MOORE: My intention was to lay on the table the matter of publication, and I have a resolution here to cover the reporting of the debates of this Convention.

Publication of Debates.

Mr. DOTY: It is out of order.

Mr. STILWELL: Is the question to lay the matter of publication only upon the table, until the close of the debates at the end of the Convention, and then let the Convention decide the question?

Mr. HARRIS, of Ashtabula: The president of the Convention unfortunately ruled the question was not divisible early in the debate. Consequently such a thing as laying a part of it on the table is clearly unparliamentary and out of the question.

Mr. MOORE: I offer another resolution to cover the whole matter.

The PRESIDENT: Does the member from Hamilton [Mr. CORDES] insist upon his motion to lay on the table?

Mr. CORDES: I certainly do.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: I have a right to explain my vote. I was on my feet before the roll call was started. I claim my privilege.

The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: I have not done it before, and I hope I will not have to do it very often. Our debates have been taken down, and they are being taken down now, are they not?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, sir.

Upon which the yeas and nays were regularly demanded, taken, and resulted—yeas 43, nays 70, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Beatty, Morrow,	Earnhart,	Pierce,
Beatty, Wood,	Eby,	Roehm,
Bowdle,	Evans,	Rorick,
Brattain,	Halenkamp,	Shaffer,
Brown, Highland,	Harbarger,	Smith, Hamilton,
Brown, Pike,	Harris, Hamilton,	Solether,
Campbell,	Harter, Huron,	Stamm,
Cassidy,	Hoffman,	Tallman,
Cody,	Kehoe,	Tetlow,
Collett,	Keller,	Ulmer,
Cordes,	Kunkel,	Watson,
Crites,	Ludey,	Weybrecht,
DeFrees,	Malin,	Wise,
Donahey,	Miller, Crawford,	Worthington.
Dunn,		

Those who voted in the negative are:

Anderson,	Johnson, Williams,	Partington,
Antrim,	Jones,	Peck,
Baum,	Kerr,	Peters,
Brown, Lucas,	Kilpatrick,	Pettit,
Crosser,	King,	Price,
Cunningham,	Knight,	Read,
Davio,	Kramer,	Riley,
Doty,	Lambert,	Rockel,
Dunlap,	Lampson,	Shaw,
Dwyer,	Leete,	Smith, Geauga,
Elson,	Leslie,	Stalter,
Farnsworth,	Longstreth,	Stevens,
FitzSimons,	Marrriott,	Stewart,
Fluke,	Marshall,	Stilwell,
Fox,	Matthews,	Stokes,
Hahn,	Mauck,	Taggart,
Halfhill,	McClelland,	Tannehill,
Harris, Ashtabula,	Miller, Fairfield,	Thomas,
Harter, Stark,	Miller, Ottawa,	Wagner,
Henderson,	Moore,	Walker,
Holtz,	Norris,	Winn,
Hoskins,	Nye,	Woods,
Hursh,	Okey,	Mr. President.
Johnson, Madison,		

Mr. WORTHINGTON: I understand the object of the pending amendment is to ascertain what the cost will be before we make any decision as to what we shall do. That being the case, it seems to me that the resolution should be a little further amended. It starts out, in the substitute that has been offered, that the debates of this Convention be reported, etc. It seems to me that to carry out the real purpose of the amendment there ought to be a further amendment, although it is not in order for me to offer it. I wish to make the suggestion to the gentleman who has offered the substitute that he insert after the word "That" the words "to assist in determining whether" the debates of the Convention be, etc.

Mr. DOTY: I think what the member said is the situation exactly, but what we are attempting to do is to substitute the resolution of the member from Fayette, because it is in better form, and thereafter the question of further amendment may be taken up in the way the member from Hamilton may desire. The question now is to get the matter in the simplest parliamentary form. If this resolution offered by the member from Fayette is in good form, I am in favor of substituting it for the whole thing, and then we are up to the situation where we can make amendments such as the member suggests.

Mr. LAMPSON: If we agree to the substitute of the member from Fayette in the form in which he presents it, that precludes further amendment.

Mr. DOTY: No, sir; not under our rules.

Mr. LAMPSON: His motion is to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert a new resolution.

Mr. DOTY: Which amounts to a substitute. When it is done we have a new resolution in fact, and a new resolution in the shape of a substitute, which we may amend.

Mr. ULMER: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I voted against this proposition successively, regarding these proceedings, printing and publishing. We have given a good deal of time to this question, and I would suggest to you to have these debates taken by an expert stenographer, and that they be printed weekly in pamphlet form, and state how many pamphlets you want, and then quit. If the legislature later on wants to have these proceedings—these debates in form—bound and printed let the legislature do that, so we don't have any more expense. Furthermore, I have another suggestion while I have the floor. We can save in another way the expense here during the taking of these debates if we put in our time and stay here Friday, too, because all of our employes are paid for every day, including Sunday, and if we prolong the debates for five or six months that will make more expense. We can have something then—we can save something to show our constituents.

Mr. WATSON: I would like to make a point of inquiry as to what committee will have control of the letting of the contracts for the printing of these proposed volumes. As chairman of the committee on Printing I rise to that point of inquiry. That goes over the head of any other committee, it seems to me.

Mr. DOTY: The committee has stated several times to the Convention, as have also the other members, that this select committee has at no time taken up the question of the debates and the contracts for printing and publishing. That is not a part of our work. We simply take up the manner of doing it, and then leave it to

Publication of Debates.

this Convention, with the members, and so far as I am concerned — so far as we are concerned — this matter may be taken up by the Printing and Publication committee, where it belongs.

Mr. PECK: What are we talking about if we are not talking about the printing of the debates?

Mr. DOTY: The question of printing has never gone to this extent. As the member from Franklin has already said here, it would cost more if we printed daily than if we printed weekly. Then if the select committee wants to know how they are going to print them, that will come up afterward, and of course we cannot decide that; the Convention must decide how they are going to print these. All we say is how the actual work ought to be so far as our committee is concerned.

Mr. WINN: Will the member yield to a question? I want to know if he is not asking the Convention to determine whether it wants the proceedings printed weekly or daily?

Mr. DOTY: That is what we are asking.

Mr. WINN: Wouldn't it be better to receive propositions on both and then have the Convention decide that question.

Mr. DOTY: I think not. I do not think people want to bid on indefinite propositions.

Mr. WINN: Is there any reason why we shouldn't receive bids separately?

Mr. DOTY: The committee did ask for bids from various stenographers, reporting people, to carry out the work under the provisions of the resolution as it then stood. We have those bids and we have never opened them, and so far as our committee is concerned we do not think it is a fair thing to open them while a controversy is going on. If that substitute or that much which provides that we shall report them verbatim, is really the way we want it done the committee desires to know.

Mr. PARTINGTON: As I understand it, this substitute resolution is to be amended to read daily or weekly.

Mr. DOTY: The member from Shelby [Mr. PARTINGTON] is quite right — that the question has not been finally determined, but we are now undertaking to put it in simple form — that is pretty nearly right, not quite right; it may still be amended in the particulars you are now asking about, but what we are asking for is to get the old resolution and all pending amendments out of the way, and we can then still amend in the manner you may desire. There is no way of having this amendment in the resolution. It is not understood to be the final action of this house upon the matter.

Mr. DEFREES: There has been a good deal of talk, but we do not know what this proposition is. Mr. Doty claims they didn't make a proposition of any kind, yet it was proposed to be divided into two separate parts; that the reporting was to cost \$12,000 and the other \$10,000.

Mr. DOTY: I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. DEFREES: I want to know what it is going to cost. It was an estimate, not a finality. We didn't know what it was going to cost, nor anything else, and we want to know.

Mr. DOTY: Are you asking me a question?

Mr. DEFREES: Yes.

Mr. DOTY: I do not know.

Mr. KNIGHT: Will the member from Miami [Mr. DEFREES] yield to a question? The chairman of this committee happens to be the one who has the matters of the committee in hand, and knows the complications that arise in the proposals. In the judgment of the chairman the pending substitute resolution is one in which the committee can readily obtain the information which the Convention desires, and can submit a report here which can be either adopted or rejected in five minutes after it is understood.

The PRESIDENT: The question is "Shall the substitute of Mr. Jones be agreed to?"

The motion was carried.

Mr. WORTHINGTON: I desire to offer the following amendment: I move to amend Resolution No. 35 as follows: After the words "Resolved that," insert "To assist in determining whether".

Mr. JONES: There is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. DOTY: I call the attention of the Convention to this. I have no objection to going at it again. The committee has made a report that would cover the amendment. What we would like to know is whether you want to do it or not?

Mr. HARRIS, of Hamilton: Wasn't that all determined in the estimates you submit? I wish to state as one who has always opposed the reporting of the debates and opposed to the printing, if a reasonable proposition is presented I will yield my own personal objection and support the proposition in deference to the wishes of the large majority of the members. But I want to say further, in answer to the remarks made by the gentleman from Lucas [Mr. ULMER] that these debates have been profitable to the people of Ohio — that the members of this Convention have succeeded in practically destroying what was called an extravagant proposition, so the debates have had some value.

Mr. HARTER, of Stark: Mr. President: If it is in order I would like to ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Highland [Mr. BROWN] be reconsidered. The amendment from yesterday.

The PRESIDENT: The president will rule that that is not in order.

Mr. PECK: It seems to me the amendment offered by Mr. Worthington is succinct, and clears up the situation. A large part of the trouble in this matter has been that it has been stated to us only in part; nobody has given it to us clearly and fully, a clear and full and substantial statement, and that is what we want and expect. If somebody would undertake to do that we might get along faster. We have always understood that you ought to decide what you want to do before you do it. This is in line with Mr. Worthington's amendment.

Mr. THOMAS: Mr. President: I would like to ask the member from Franklin [Mr. KNIGHT] if the substitute will permit the furnishing of an estimate of the cost of furnishing stenographers direct to the Convention.

Mr. JONES: My own objection to the matter would be that under the circumstances we would be confined to submitting bids upon the work specified upon the basis of the third subdivision of the resolution. Of course,

Publication of Debates—Introduction of Proposals, Etc.

the reporting and transcribing might be submitted at so much per day—to do the stenographic work so much per day, and transcribing so much per folio. It might to be done in various ways. We might make it per day and cover so many days under the limit; that would be taken up by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS: When this amendment of Mr. Worthington's is disposed of, I will offer another, so that we may see whether it is not more economical to hire our own stenographers direct.

The motion was carried.

Mr. THOMAS: I offer the following amendment: Amend Resolution No. 35 as follows: After the word "awarded" insert "or determine on the cost of employing stenographers direct."

The amendment was carried.

Mr. DOTY: I want to say that the resolution as it now stands does not enable our committee to report on the printing. Whether you report that or not, we are determined to make a report that the matter of printing go over to the committee on Printing.

The original resolution as amended was adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. President: It is with considerable embarrassment that I am compelled to suggest a question of privilege. I find that a marked copy of a certain paper—I do not care to name it—has been sent to each delegate, purporting to give an account of the meeting of the Up-to-Date club, at Youngstown, Ohio, which to some extent might be construed as a reflection upon the integrity of some of the delegates.

If the gentlemen will stop to remember, before the Convention assembled to each delegate was sent certain papers representing certain interests in the state, the paper being known as the Liberal Advertiser. I never knew there was such a paper in existence until I received a copy of it, some weeks or months before the Convention assembled. That paper contained considerable abuse concerning myself. Not only did that edition contain this, but other papers of the same name that were sent were also abusive in their character. I paid no attention to it. I did not believe that the delegates would pay any attention to it, for the reason that the name of the paper, being in the interest of the thing for which it was issued, was sufficient guaranty it would receive no attention from any decent man. I would not be standing here now and calling attention to it if you really know as I do, and the people in Mahoning county know, that this paper deserves no more recognition than the Liberal Advocate. I think that the whole thing can be explained when I say that the manager of this paper was the man whom I defeated, and the people of Mahoning county, not by my popularity, but by the unpopularity of this man, gave me a very large majority.

I want to say to you that anything that reflects on any delegate or purports to be absolutely untrue. It was put here for that. I say to you, and I think you will believe me when I say it, I have the greatest friendship for all the delegates, and I want to say, when it comes time to adjourn—I want to say—"Good-bye, my friend," and I want to mean it when I say "my friend." I do not believe I can add anything to that, and I shall not attempt to. I thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. STOKES: I move we adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. There has been a great deal of

talk here about economy. As the member from Lucas well said, whether we remain in session or not, there are certain employes of this Convention that have to be paid. It is costing us three or four hundred dollars a day, whether we are in session or not. If we mean business and if we mean to go ahead and conduct the business of this Convention, it is our duty to come here on Monday and put in practically the entire week in the work of this Convention. I do not mean by this motion to detain any individual here whose business requires his presence at home, but there are enough of us to conduct the business without them. If those who can come would be here, we can go ahead and transact the business of this Convention.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Williams: In order to hustle the business along, I move we take a recess until this afternoon, at 1:30 o'clock, and settle this business. What is the use of talking about printing when we don't know what we want to do? I fought against this resolution, and I will fight against every proposition to delay matters. I don't want to table it. We can settle it after we get a good dinner today just as well as any other time in the world. That is the reason I move a recess until 1:30 today.

Mr. HURSH: I wish to say for the instruction of the delegates that the committee on Employes has a report to make, and I hope we will act on Mr. Johnson's suggestion, that we recess until this afternoon.

Mr. STOKES: I withdraw my motion.

The motion to recess was carried.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention met pursuant to recess, and was called to order by the president.

The PRESIDENT: We will now have the introduction of proposals and the secretary will call the roll.

INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSALS.

The following proposals were introduced and read the first time:

Proposal No. 210—Mr. Smith, of Geauga. To submit an amendment to article XII, section 2, of the constitution.—Relative to taxation.

Proposal No. 211—Mr. Taggart. Relative to elective franchise.

MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. STOKES: I offer an amendment to Rule No. 41. The amendment was read as follows:

Strike out the word "and" in the fourth line after "Wednesdays" and after the word "Thursdays" insert "and Fridays" in the same line.

In the fifth line strike out the word "Fridays."

Mr. STOKES: I move that the amendment be referred to the committee on Rules:

The motion was carried.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: I offer a resolution.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolution No. 56:

Motions and Resolutions—Publication of Debates—Petitions and Memorials.

Resolved, That the thanks of this Convention are due and are hereby extended to the Hon. E. W. Hughes, parliamentarian of the house of representatives, for his valuable services rendered this Convention in its organization and his later service of presiding as parliamentarian for the Convention.

By unanimous consent the rules were suspended and the resolution was considered at once.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. MILLER, of Crawford: I offer a resolution.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolution No. 57:

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 session shall be held on Saturdays.

Mr. MILLER, of Crawford: I move that the resolution be referred to the committee on Rules.

The motion was carried.

Mr. MARRIOTT: I offer a resolution.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolution No. 58:

Resolved, That the secretary of the Convention is hereby authorized to appoint Miss Isabel Young to the position of financial clerk and registrar of lobbyists; who shall receive the same per diem as other clerks of the Convention.

Mr. MARRIOTT: I move that the resolution be referred to the committee on Employes.

The motion was carried.

Mr. RILEY: I move that the motion to reconsider the vote whereby the report of the committee recommending the indefinite postponement of Proposal No. 13 was agreed to, be taken from the table.

The PRESIDENT: The question is "Shall the motion to reconsider be agreed to?"

Mr. RILEY: I move that further consideration of the motion be postponed until Tuesday.

The motion was carried.

Mr. DOTY: Mr. President: I just wanted to state that the member from Franklin [Mr. KNIGHT] has a resolution he would like to read to us.

Mr. KNIGHT: I offer a resolution.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolution No. 59:

Resolved, That in view of the fact that since the select committee under Resolution No. 22 was created, the standing committee on Printing and Publication has been appointed; that the duties and instructions given to said select committee, pursuant to substitute Resolution No. 35, be and are hereby transferred to the standing committee on Printing and Publication, and that the select committee created under Resolution No. 22 is hereby discharged.

Mr. KNIGHT: I move that the rules be suspended and the resolution considered at once.

The motion was carried.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. President: The select committee agreed to take up the matter of the reporting and printing of the debates. There were only standing committees appointed. That committee has performed, as it believes, all the business for such a committee to perform. Since that time the standing committee on Printing and Publication has been appointed, consequently it would seem to be the duty of such a committee rather than of the select committee to carry out the instructions adopted this morning under substitute Resolution No. 55, and the committee feels that there is nothing for it to do in the matter. And in view of the further fact that the select committee has put about as much time on the matter as it feels this Convention ought to ask them to do, this resolution is introduced, with the understanding, however, that the select committee does not feel free, and will not feel free, to turn over to said committee on Printing and Publication any bids or proposals now in its hands and unopened. I hope the resolution will pass.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: I move that the chairman of the committee—I sincerely hope that the resolution will not pass, Mr. President. I think it would be better for the Convention to retain the committee that it has had. I think it would be very bad policy for us to take their work, which they do very well, and I wish to move that the committee be continued in the house.

Mr. HALFHILL: Mr. President: In view of the work of this committee—they have done their best in our interest, and they have been disposed to be fair, and every amendment and suggestion that has been offered has been accepted. They have done a great amount of work, but notwithstanding this fact I don't feel like relieving them, and I do hope that this committee will not only not be relieved, but that they will still do their work.

Mr. HOSKINS: Mr. President: As a member of that committee, I hope the resolution will not pass. I want to see the committee appointed at the beginning of this Convention continue in that capacity until we get the thing in the proper shape. I hope that that committee will be retained.

Mr. DOTY: I simply rise to concur in the remarks Mr. Hoskins has made as not applying to me. It is Mr. Knight who has done the real hard work.

Mr. WATSON: As chairman of the standing committee on Printing and Publication, I want to say a resolution was passed whereby we would accept from the select committee's hands their work up to a certain period, and we stand yet ready to receive that work up to that period, but I wish that this would be held up until they finish their work.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: I move that this matter be laid on the table.

The motion was carried.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. Shaffer presented the petition of Max Strauss and one hundred eighty other citizens of Butler county,

Petitions and Memorials.

in favor of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Halfhill presented the remonstrance of the Rev. E. M. Counsellor, and twenty-three other citizens of Lima, against the adoption of any license clause to regulate liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Wagner presented the petition of Levi Minnich and other citizens of Darke county, relative to the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the First Baptist church, of Madison, Lake county, opposed to the license clause in the state constitution asking members of the Convention to vote against it; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the Congregational Sunday school, of Jefferson, asking that no submission should be made by the Constitutional Convention that would give to the liquor traffic any legitimate recognition; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of the Welsh Baptist church, of Youngstown, asking for the adoption of an amendment granting woman's suffrage by the Convention; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the Methodist, Congregational and Christian churches of Vaughnsville, Putnam county, protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause by the Convention; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the Grace United Evangelical church, of Findlay, protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause by the Constitutional Convention; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the First Methodist Episcopal church, of Jefferson, opposing any license system, restricted or unrestricted; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the First Congregational church, of Lexington, asking the Constitutional Convention to use its power and influence against making any provision in the new constitution to license the liquor traffic in any form; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Miller, of Ottawa, presented the petition of Frank Gernhard and nineteen other citizens of Port Clinton, favoring the passage of Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the First Christian church, of Lima, protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause in the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the Second Congregational church, of Toledo, protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause by the Convention; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the Methodist Episcopal church, of Mansfield, protesting against

the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause by the Constitutional Convention; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of the Haselton Baptist church, of Youngstown, asking for the submission of a woman's suffrage clause by the Convention; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of C. E. Herrick, of Ashtabula county, protesting against any legislation that will tend to favor the saloon and brewing interests; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of J. M. Hipple, of Ashtabula county, protesting against the licensing of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the Methodist Episcopal church, of Edgerton, Williams county, protesting against the submission of a clause in the new constitution as now being drawn, providing unrestricted license of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of Walnut Street Baptist church, of Youngstown, protesting against the proposed unrestricted license clause to the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of a church of Pandora, Putnam county, protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause by the Constitutional Convention; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of Olive Place Baptist church, of Toledo, protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause by the Convention; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the Methodist Episcopal church of Bluffton, protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause by the Constitutional Convention; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petition of J. W. Beall, and one hundred forty other citizens of Allen county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petition of M. C. Howey, and many other citizens of Allen county, praying for prohibition as an alternative to a restriction license clause to govern the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petition of the Rev. John S. Halfaker, and R. B. Miksell, clerk for the membership of the First Christian church, of Anna, Shelby county, indorsing Proposal No. 58; which was referred to the committee on Taxation.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petition of the Rev. J. H. Butler, and several other citizens of Allen county, against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause to govern the liquor traffic and urging the submission of state-wide prohibition; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petition of the Rev. David

Petitions and Memorials.

Hugh Jones, and twenty other citizens of Allen county, being members in session of the board of trustees of Market Street Presbyterian church, of Lima, indorsing Proposal No. 58; which was referred to the committee on Taxation.

Mr. Pierce presented the petition of L. M. Larsh, and ninety-nine other citizens of Butler county, asking that the traffic in intoxicating liquors be licensed, and requesting that Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King, be adopted, without amendment; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petition of the Rev. Geo. B. Wiltsie, pastor, and membership of congregation, of M. E. church, of Delphos, against licensing the liquor traffic and in favor of prohibition; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petition of the Rev. John A. Lucy, pastor, and Lewis Hefner, secretary of Salem M. E. Sabbath school, of Auglaize tp., Allen county, indorsing Proposal No. 58; which was referred to the committee on Taxation.

Mr. Pierce presented the petition of Fred Reichel and ninety-nine other citizens of Butler county, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King, without amendment; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Matthews presented the memorial of several churches and W. C. T. U. unions and other citizens of Putnam county and asked to have them referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Dr. W. N. Boyer and two hundred fifty-four other citizens of Allen county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of James A. Moore and three hundred ninety-four other citizens of Ashtabula county relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of F. Goeke and one hundred eighty-five other citizens of Auglaize county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Albert Luchs and other citizens of Belmont county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Wm. E. Hart and five hundred ninety-six other citizens of Butler county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Thos. L. White and fourteen other citizens of Clark county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Sam Few and eight other citizens of Clermont county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Ennis Ward and twelve other citizens of Clinton county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of C. J. Bowen and eighteen other citizens of Coshocton county, relat-

ing to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Emery Fesco and three hundred ninety other citizens of Cuyahoga county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of W. P. Jacobs and other citizens of Fayette county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Vinton J. Parr and eight other citizens of Franklin county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Henry W. Cherrington and three other citizens of Gallia county, relative to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of E. H. Shildrick and twenty-one other citizens of Geauga county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Wm. Stengrs and one thousand five hundred and ninety-five other citizens of Hamilton county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of W. G. Klinepeter and other citizens of Hancock county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of M. C. Vashbinder and other citizens of Harrison county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Otto P. Tutzens and other citizens of Henry county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of C. J. Jenkins and other citizens of Jefferson county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of H. S. Willard and sixty other citizens of Lake county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Dr. C. R. Oderkute and seventy-two other citizens of Lawrence county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Frank Foye and other citizens of Licking county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of T. E. Berrington and other citizens of Logan county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Ross Fauver and ninety-one other citizens of Lorain county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Leo Adams and

Petitions and Memorials.

seventy other citizens of Lucas county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of William Brown and one hundred twenty-two other citizens of Mahoning county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of A. O. Johnson and twenty other citizens of Meigs county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of A. B. Grimm and other citizens of Mercer county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Raymond Cavanaugh and other citizens of Miami county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of N. E. Dunham and four hundred thirty-eight other citizens of Montgomery county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of John Lauerman and forty-seven other citizens of Pike county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of E. Dutcher and one other citizen of Portage county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Will E. Schlienty and other citizens of Preble county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of F. E. Kloeppel and ninety-one other citizens of Putnam county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of W. H. Dyer and other citizens of Ross county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of J. W. Coe and other citizens of Sandusky county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of A. R. Donnenwirth and one other citizen of Summit county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of J. S. Hughes and two hundred ninety-seven other citizens of Trumbull county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of George V. Sheridan, and other citizens of Union county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Nick Hummer, and thirty-one other citizens of Van Wert county, re-

lating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Charles Thorne, and other citizens of Warren county, relating to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Wise presented the petition of Molly Stark Council No. 60, composed of one hundred and seventy members, of Alliance, Stark county, relative to woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Cassidy presented the petition of Willia G. Knight, and fifteen other citizens of Logan county, asking that this Convention submit to the voters of Ohio the question of granting equal suffrage to the women of the state; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Dr. J. B. McClure, and twenty-two other citizens of Washington county, relating to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Kilpatrick presented the resolution of the Sunday school of the First Congregational church, of Newton Falls, against the license of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Kilpatrick presented the resolution of the First Congregational church, of Newton Falls, against the licensing of the liquor traffic by the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Cassidy presented the petition of Lydia P. Folsom and fifty-five other citizens of Logan county, asking that this Convention submit to the voters of Ohio the question of granting equal suffrage to the women of the state; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Matthews presented the petition of H. S. Wurst and seventy-five other citizens of Putnam county, relative to the Liquor Traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Cassidy presented the petition of J. L. Stanfield and fifty-five other citizens of Logan county, asking that this Convention submit to the voters of Ohio the question of granting equal suffrage to the women of the state; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Cassidy presented the petition of Jessie Gibson and forty-six other citizens of Logan county, asking that this Convention submit to the voters of Ohio the question of granting equal suffrage to the women of the state; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Shaffer presented the petition of Jim Mooney and two hundred twenty-five other citizens of Butler county, favoring the adoption of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Fox presented the petition of twenty-four citizens of Mercer county, relative to Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Matthews presented the petition of Harvey McDowell and seventy other citizens of Putnam county, favoring Proposal No. 4—Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Dwyer presented the petition of Roscoe R.

Petitions and Memorials.

Weaver and nineteen other citizens of Montgomery county, in favor of the passage of Proposal No 4 — Mr. King; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Kilpatrick presented the petition of W. C. Allison and fifty-nine other citizens of Trumbull county against license; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Partington presented the petition of Joe Bustetter and six other citizens of Shelby county, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4, without amendment; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Cassidy presented the petition of Alice N. Hamilton and fifty-five other citizens of Logan county, asking that this Convention submit to the voters of Ohio

the question of granting equal suffrage to the women of the state; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Cassidy presented the petition of Thomas H. Brown and thirty-four other citizens of Logan county, asking that this Convention submit to the voters of Ohio the question of granting equal suffrage to the women of the state; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Partington presented the petition of Earl Lee and three other citizens of Shelby county, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. WALKER: I move that we adjourn.
The motion was carried.