

SIXTEENTH DAY

MORNING SESSION.

WEDNESDAY, February 7, 1912.

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment, was called to order by the president and opened with prayer by the Rev. H. W. Kellogg, of Columbus, Ohio.

The journal of yesterday was read.

Mr. KING: Is my name recorded as voting in the negative on that roll call? I so voted.

The PRESIDENT: If it is not so recorded the secretary will please so record it.

Mr. DOTY: May I make an inquiry? The member from Erie [Mr. KING] raises a question as to whether he is recorded as voting in the negative on the proposal which was adopted yesterday. May I inquire as to what the journal discloses?

Mr. PECK: The journal does not disclose his name.

The SECRETARY: The official roll call shows that he voted in the negative.

Mr. DOTY: The only reason I inquired is that some members think they can amend a roll call. I did not know what the facts were in this particular case.

Mr. PECK: I think the minutes ought to be corrected. The journal shows that I moved "That the committee of the Whole rise and report to the Convention." That is not the motion I made. I moved that the committee rise and report Substitute Proposal No. 54 favorably to the Convention.

Mr. LAMPSON: The gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. PECK] is correct. The correction he suggests should be made, and in this connection I ask that the secretary read the full report as made by me as chairman of the committee of the Whole.

The SECRETARY (reading): "Mr. Peck moved that the committee of the Whole rise and report to the Convention"—

Mr. PECK: And right there should be added "recommending the passage of the substitute for Proposal No. 54."

Mr. LAMPSON: I would like the secretary to read my report as chairman of the committee of the Whole. I think that sets it out.

The SECRETARY (reading):

Mr. Lampson, chairman of the committee of the Whole, submitted the following report: "That the committee of the Whole Convention, having had under consideration Substitute Proposal No. 54—Mr. Elson, relative to the reform of the jury system, has decided to rise and has directed its chairman to report said substitute proposal to the Convention with the recommendation that the substitute proposal do pass."

Mr. DOTY: Another suggestion. I think the journal should show where the committee of the Whole be-

gins and where it ends. On page 4 of the journal, where it says: "Mr. Peck moved that the committee of the Whole rise and report to the Convention," the next line says the motion was agreed to, but there is nothing to indicate that we were then in the Convention.

There should be the words "In Convention" as a sort of head.

Mr. LAMPSON: Where is that?

Mr. PECK: Before your name.

Mr. DOTY: On page 4 there is a headline "Pending Debate" and then Mr. Peck moves that the committee of the Whole rise, etc. When that motion was agreed to, that was the end of the committee of the Whole.

Mr. LAMPSON: That is not the end of the committee of the Whole. The end of the committee of the Whole is when the report of the chairman of the committee of the Whole is offered.

Mr. DOTY: We don't agree on that, but there should be something on this page to indicate where the committee of the Whole begins and ends.

Mr. LAMPSON: I think that is indicated. It says: "Mr. Lampson, chairman of the committee of the Whole, submitted the following report, etc., and then it says, "The report was agreed to." Now, that is where we are back into Convention.

Mr. DOTY: I do not agree with the delegate from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] as to that, but we have a decision of the chair on that, and I am not raising that question at this time, but our record, in order to be reasonably well understood, should have some headline showing where the committee of the Whole begins and where it ends. We have had a decision of the chair as to where the committee of the Whole does end and where the Convention begins.

Mr. LAMPSON: We have not had any decision on that which can change the fact. The fact is the main thing is this controversy, and the fact is that when the chairman of the committee of the Whole obeyed the mandate of the committee and reported to the Convention we were back in the Convention, and then the next step, which was the first step in the Convention, was when the report was agreed to. The next motion then was a motion by Mr. Worthington.

Mr. HALFHILL: Mr. President:—

The PRESIDENT: The gentleman from Allen.

Mr. FESS: I beg pardon—

The PRESIDENT: Does the delegate from Allen yield?

Mr. HALFHILL: I yield to him.

Mr. FESS: I want to rise upon the question made by Mr. Lampson in reference to when the committee of the Whole ends its session. If the committee of the Whole is not ended until after its report is heard, then the committee of the Whole presents its report to the committee of the Whole, and if the committee of the

Correction of the Journal.

Whole presents its report to the committee of the Whole, then it is the chairman of the committee of the Whole presenting the report to the chairman of the committee of the Whole. It is the same person reporting to the same person. I say that the committee of the Whole ends when the motion to rise carries. The presiding officer then is the president of this Convention, and all proceedings after that are in the Convention and not in the committee of the Whole. That was the decision of the presiding officer yesterday, and that stands until reversed. Mr. Lampson had a right to appeal from the decision of the chair yesterday, but that ruling was agreed to and as we stand now the committee of the Whole is at an end and we are in Convention the moment the motion to rise is carried in committee of the Whole.

Mr. LAMPSON: It is a matter of fact, and no matter what ruling might be made it would not change the fact. The fact is that we have a presiding officer of the Convention, and a different presiding officer of the committee of the Whole. The presiding officer of the committee of the Whole, under the mandate of the committee of the Whole, was instructed to report its action to the Convention. Each of the two chairmen has a function to perform and neither of these functions can be separately performed. The two combined constitute and complete the act which terminates the committee of the Whole, and it is a fact, and no amount of rule will change it. Any court in looking over the journal will look back to see when we got into committee of the Whole and when we got into Convention. Let me suggest what would have happened yesterday upon the theory of my friend. If he had taken his seat as presiding officer of the Convention and Mr. Brown, the chairman of the committee of the Whole, had taken his seat and remained silent, and the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DORV] and the gentleman from Franklin [Mr. KNIGHT] had succeeded in getting the report of their special committee before the house and the house had considered it and taken a ye and nay vote upon it and adopted it, there would not have been anything in the journal to show that we were out of committee of the Whole, and that act as far as the journal would show would have been in the committee of the Whole, and the committee of the Whole has no right to take a ye and nay vote and the whole thing would have been a nullity. I do not care to argue further. I have seen this practiced in a much larger parliamentary body than this for sixteen years, and I have never seen before one speaker or one presiding officer of the committee of the Whole or one member of the lower house of congress raise a question like this. It was conceded on all hands. Sometimes it has happened that a member in haste to get something up would rise, as did the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DORV], and attempt to bring up some matter, but the speaker would at once refuse to recognize him until the chairman of the committee of the Whole made his report, and every member would recognize that that was correct proceeding and would acquiesce in it. So in sixteen years' experience in the lower house of congress where the committee of the Whole is the regular course in considering great business, I have never seen a single member raise such a question as this before.

So in conclusion, I say after all it is not a parliamentary question which any decision of the chair can

settle, but it is a question of fact as to when the committee of the Whole ended and when we were back into the Convention, and the proceedings will show that.

Mr. FESS: I want this Convention to note the specific statements of the gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] and recognize what would be the ultimate conclusion of them if he is correct. If he has seen for sixteen years this question raised and decided, that does not mean that when raised it has been decided wrongly or rightly, and if he says that the committee of the Whole is not adjourned, or if he says its work is not ended until the chairman of that committee has reported to the house, then I ask him how it is possible that you can report the work of a committee to any other body except the house? How can it be possible that you have the committee still in session when you make its report to the body that is to receive it?

Mr. LAMPSON: It is like a contract. Two minds must meet. Each party has its function to perform before the act is complete. Each chairman had his function to perform before the act was complete. When each chairman performed his function the act was complete. The president of the Convention was to resume his seat. That was the first thing. The next step was for the chairman of the committee of the Whole to perform his function and make his report to the president of the Convention in the presence of the membership. The two acts coming together completed the whole act and got the committee of the Whole back into the Convention, and one acting separately could not do it. How did the president of the Convention know what the committee of the Whole had done until it made its report? He could not know.

Mr. FESS: Certainly; the vote to rise was carried.

Mr. LAMPSON: But the presiding officer of the Convention is not the presiding officer of the committee of the Whole, and he is not presumed to know what was done in the committee of the Whole. His only knowledge of what is there done is through the report of the committee of the Whole, evidenced to him by its responsible officer, the chairman of the committee of the Whole. Until that chairman has reported the president of the Convention does not know what the committee of the Whole has done, and does not know that the committee of the Whole has decided to rise and make a report.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: What is the import of all of this discussion? There is no doubt that one of you gentlemen is right, but we have our record and if the matter is wrong as it now stands it can be corrected the next meeting of the committee of the Whole we have, and I believe that taking up the time of the Convention on matters of no value is waste of time without reason, and I would ask the gentleman from Greene [Mr. FESS] to drop the matter.

Mr. FESS: The question that is before us now was not raised by me. Why not ask the gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] to drop it? He was the one who insisted on it.

Mr. LAMPSON: Why, Mr. President —

Mr. FESS: I have not yielded the floor. I have it and I am going to keep it. I do not ask for any concessions whatever. The gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] has stated when the sessions of the committee of the Whole end, and he is wrong. He says that

Correction of the Journal.

a session of the committee of the Whole is ended when the report is received by the Convention. That cannot be. It ends when the committee rises, and the committee of the Whole reports not to itself, but to the open Convention.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: What action do you want the Convention to take?

Mr. FESS: I want the correction attempted to be made by the gentleman from Ashtabula not to be recognized. I want the suggestion of the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY] that when the committee rises it is ready to report, and when I was in the chair and the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY] rose, I did not know what he wanted to say, and it was my duty to listen to what he had to say; and if what he had to say pertained to other than the action of the committee of the Whole, he would have been declared out of order instantly, but it was right that I should recognize him to know what kind of a motion he wanted to make; and I insist that I was right in recognizing him.

Mr. LAMPSON: Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. FESS: Yes.

Mr. LAMPSON: The gentleman from Greene [Mr. FESS] has said if the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY] had suggested anything other than pertaining to the committee of the Whole, he would have been declared out of order instantly. It was my point that he was out of order and that there was nothing in order except hearing the report of the committee of the Whole. Now, with that I am satisfied.

Mr. FESS: I want to ask the gentleman from Ashtabula a question.

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

The PRESIDENT: The gentleman from Defiance [Mr. WINN] will state his point of order.

Mr. WINN: I make the point of order that these gentlemen are not discussing any question now before the Convention.

The PRESIDENT: The discussion is on a question relative to the journal.

Mr. DOTY: I asked a question on the journal and there was a ruling of the chair as to how it should be corrected.

The PRESIDENT: The ruling of the chair is —

Mr. LAMPSON: I am not asking a correction of the journal.

Mr. DOTY: But I am.

Mr. LAMPSON: What is the correction?

Mr. DOTY: I ask to have the journal show in words at the point just preceding the report of the gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] as chairman of the committee of the Whole that we were in Convention.

Mr. PECK: Why not state just what happened? That would show where we left the committee of the Whole and where we went back into Convention.

Mr. LAMPSON: The journal shows what happened, and we don't want to inject anything.

The PRESIDENT: Will the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY] state exactly where he thinks the words "In Convention" should be inserted?

Mr. DOTY: We had a ruling on that yesterday. We are in Convention and on motion we go into committee of the Whole. At that point, when we go into commit-

tee of the Whole and someone is called to the chair as chairman of committee of the Whole, it should be stated, "In Committee of the Whole", and we are in committee of the Whole until a motion that the committee rise and report is agreed to. Right there is where the words "In Convention" should be put, so that it can be plainly seen that we are back in Convention.

Mr. LAMPSON: The gentleman is trying to make a correction and show something that didn't happen.

Mr. DOTY: No; I am not. That is in issue between us.

Mr. LAMPSON: Just what happens goes into the journal.

The PRESIDENT: The president will have to rule in deference to the decision yesterday that the correction should be made as indicated by the member from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY].

Mr. DOTY: And I ask that the correction be made, "That the president of the Convention resumed the chair."

Mr. LAMPSON: Where?

Mr. DOTY: Between the lines "The motion was agreed to" and the next line where "Mr. Lampson, chairman of the committee of the Whole, submitted the following report," etc. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. LAMPSON: I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. KNIGHT: There is also a similar situation on page 1 of the journal under the heading "Pending Debates." "Mr. Doty moved that the committee of the Whole rise and report to the Convention. The motion was agreed to."

At that point, just as here, the report of the committee of the Whole is submitted. The correction should also be made there.

Mr. LAMPSON: What is the correction desired there?

Mr. DOTY: I want it to show that the president resumed the chair.

The PRESIDENT: Let the correction be made.

Mr. KERR: I would like to have my vote recorded in the vote on that matter of yesterday.

The SECRETARY: It is recorded in the official ballot.

Mr. CORDES: I want my vote recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. DOTY: Did the member vote?

Mr. CORDES: Yes.

The SECRETARY: The name of the gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. CORDES] does not appear on the roll call as having voted.

Mr. CORDES: Well, I voted all right.

The SECRETARY: I cannot correct the journal.

Mr. DOTY: I rise to a point of order. The rules provide a manner in which any member can see if his name is recorded properly on the roll call—

Mr. CORDES: I voted.

The PRESIDENT: The point is well taken.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: Mr. Cordes voted in favor of that report, and do you rule, Mr. President, that he cannot have his name so recorded?

Mr. LAMPSON: I would like to understand this. We are reading the journal for the purpose of correcting errors, and if a member voted and he is not recorded as

Correction of the Journal.

voting he has a right to make that correction now. That is one of the purposes of reading the journal.

Mr. PECK: Certainly.

Mr. LAMPSON: The secretary has not full control over the votes of the membership.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: Judge King just had his vote recorded in the negative.

Mr. WATSON: How can a man know how he is recorded as voting? The rules provide for a call of the roll; how can any member see that he is properly recorded when the time has gone by when a man may correct the journal? How do we know that our votes are properly recorded?

Mr. DOTY: You can find by asking.

Mr. WATSON: This is one way of asking.

Mr. DOTY: But the wrong way.

Mr. PECK: There are two things about that roll business—first, when the vote is taken and announced; if a member thinks his vote has not been properly classified or counted, he can have the roll called and the vote corrected, but when we are correcting the minutes the next day, if the minutes do not show his vote correctly, he has a right to have them corrected and the vote put down correctly.

Mr. LAMPSON: There cannot be any question of that. It is the purpose of reading the journal for approval to correct any error in a roll call or anything else.

The PRESIDENT: The president has ruled otherwise.

Mr. LAMPSON: Then I appeal respectfully from the decision of the chair. If the secretary records every member of the Convention wrong and the members don't discover it before the journal is made up, we have to go down in history as having voted the exact opposite to what we intended.

Mr. WATSON: What would the members of the Convention have to do with the printing? Don't printers make errors, and have we not the power to correct them when they are made?

Mr. HOSKINS: Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Does the gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] yield the floor?

Mr. LAMPSON: I have made an appeal from the decision of the chair that the journal as to that vote cannot be corrected.

Mr. HOSKINS: An inquiry? We are confused here. As I understand it, we are reading the journal for the purpose of correction, to know what has happened and whether we are properly recorded in the voting. Are we to understand that in order to make certain our votes are properly recorded we must go to the secretary and find out or have it verified by an open roll call, or can we call attention to it when the journal is read the next day? It seems to me the purpose in reading the journal is to make corrections, and we want to get right on this matter. I do not know anything about parliamentary law, but I know something about the common sense of things, and if that is not our rule now I want it changed at once, so that when that journal is read I can correct it if my vote is not recorded properly. It seems to me that ought to be the rule now and if it isn't I want it made that way. I don't want to overrule the

chairman of the Convention if he properly interprets our present rule, but if that is the rule I want it changed.

Mr. DOTY: For the purpose of facilitating matters, I withdraw my point of order and will allow the gentleman to make the correction.

Mr. HALFHILL: But does the gentleman intend to make the same point every time it comes up?

Mr. DOTY: No; it is a matter of comparatively little importance.

Mr. HARRIS, of Ashtabula: It is a matter of great importance to the men who vote.

Mr. PECK: The withdrawal is too late. The matter is in the hands of the Convention and motions have been made relative thereto.

Mr. WINN: This is as good a time to settle the matter as any other, and we ought to settle it right. I love to agree with the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY], but there are sometimes when we should insist on our rights whether we agree with the member from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY] or not.

Mr. KERR: I find that my name is not recorded in the journal as having voted in favor of the proposition that was adopted by the affirmative vote of 93 to 11. I had a deep interest in the result of that vote and this morning, picking up the journal, I do not find my name. I would want to find some way in which a correction of that could be made and I would not want the correction made because the member from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY] would consent to it. Now there is an appeal here from the decision of the chair. Let that appeal be put and go upon record, and then we shall have a rule that will guide us.

Mr. CROSSER: That will not guide us at all. I think the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY] is wrong.

The PRESIDENT: As the house rules, the president would decide this matter in future. The question now is on sustaining the decision of the chair.

Mr. HOSKINS: May I ask a question? Do I understand if the members of this Convention sustain the appeal and overrule the president, that that will constitute the ruling of the chair on this proposition hereafter?

The PRESIDENT: Certainly.

Mr. HOSKINS: If that is the case, I am ready to vote. I do not want to reflect on the chair, but if it is establishing precedent I want to vote on the question.

Mr. LAMPSON: I did not take the appeal with any idea of reflecting on the decision of the chair. I want a correct precedent, just as the gentleman has stated.

Mr. TETLOW: I want some information on this matter. If the decision of the chair is sustained, is there any method by which corrections of this kind can be made?

The PRESIDENT: If the decision of the chair is sustained corrections will be made on the question of privilege, by the member asking the Convention for the record to be changed according to the way he says he voted.

Mr. PRICE: We do not want to be in the position of overruling the president if he is right. Would the president explain the rule?

The PRESIDENT: If any member knows the rule,

Correction of the Journal.

I would be glad to have it quoted. No one apparently knows the rule, nor does he know where to find it.

The president made the decision with the realization that some decision must be made, and the decision furnishes an opportunity for the house to express itself upon the question and establish a precedent to instruct the chair in like cases for the future, and the vote will not reflect at all on the president. On the contrary, the president is most anxious to have the Convention guide him in this matter, as there seems to be no rule bearing on the subject.

Mr. DOTY: Of course it is a matter of the utmost indifference to me what rules we have as long as we know what they are. What I contended for is that a member may not be in Cincinnati today—I will confess that this member is stating exactly the truth, and I will change that and say I am opposed to a member being in Cleveland today—and coming into this Convention tomorrow and ask that a roll call be corrected to include him on the proposition. That is all there is in the proposition. There is no reason why every member in the house should not know how his vote is recorded because the rules provides that a poll of the vote may be taken by any member of the Convention before the result of the roll call is announced. The member from Columbiana [Mr. TELLOW] asked a pertinent question. If a member is reported wrongly, as the member from Defiance says he was, and he wants a correction, that is a correction of fact. But the only way to get a vote from the member's seat to the secretary's desk is by spoken word and it must be heard at the secretary's desk. If it is spoken over there and not heard over there, the vote is not made. There can be no question about that. The secretary must hear it. Even if it be a mechanical error, it is easily corrected. It is easy to get a vote in the wrong column. Things like that can be corrected. But a member who has voted in such a low tone that he could not be heard, and who has not insisted on finding out whether he was heard, waives his right as to that roll call. But the rules provide in order that a man shall not go thundering down through the ages without having his vote recorded correctly that he may rise at the proper time and get his vote recorded, so that the journal for that day will show his vote on that proposition. That is the procedure that has always been carried out, and it allows the journal to state exactly what happened.

Mr. CROSSER: Is not that exactly what the gentleman wants to do? Does he not claim that he has been wrongly reported, and that he wants to be set right?

Mr. DOTY: If so, I misunderstood him. If the member from Cuyahoga [Mr. CROSSER] has stated what happened, of course I misunderstood it. I understood him to say that he was not recorded at all and he wanted to be recorded, is that right? Therefore the member from Cuyahoga [Mr. CROSSER] is mistaken.

Mr. KNIGHT: If a member of this Convention votes and the record of that vote does not appear on the journal, is not that just as much an error on the journal as if he had voted aye and is recorded no?

Mr. DOTY: Probably not. If you had ever been at that desk you would know the difference. The man calling the roll is human like the rest of us and he puts down what he hears. If the member from Cincinnati votes in a low tone and there is confusion his vote does

not get to the secretary. It is not the fault of the secretary. The vote simply never gets there and it is not a vote.

Mr. KNIGHT: Therefore the record is not correct.

Mr. DOTY: The record is correct. The vote never got there. The rules protect the member. The member can rise before the roll call is announced and demand to know whether he is recorded as voting and how, or a poll of the whole Convention may be demanded. Everybody knows that he can do that.

Mr. WATSON: Do one hundred and nineteen people have to rise every time the roll is called to find out how they voted?

Mr. DOTY: If the one hundred and nineteen are in doubt, they should rise.

Mr. LAMPSON: If a member were in Cleveland and didn't vote and next day wanted to be recorded as voting, it would not be a correction of the journal, would it?

Mr. DOTY: No, sir.

Mr. LAMPSON: Then have you not been discussing something that is not apropos?

Mr. DOTY: It makes no difference whether he was in Cleveland and didn't get his voice here or whether he sits over there and didn't get his voice here.

Mr. LAMPSON: I think it does.

Mr. STOKES: I move the previous question on this matter.

The PRESIDENT: The question of appeal will now be put. The yeas and nays were demanded, and the secretary will please call the roll on the question of whether the president's ruling shall be sustained.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: May I have the floor a moment?

The PRESIDENT: You are out of order.

The question being "Shall the decision of the president be sustained?"

The yeas and nays were regularly demanded.

The yeas and nays were taken, and resulted—yeas 6, nays 105, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Doty,	Kramer,	Ulmer,
Johnson,	Malin,	Worthington.
of Williams,		

Those who voted in the negative are:

Anderson,	Dwyer,	Kehoe,
Antrim,	Earnhart,	Keller,
Baum,	Eby,	Kerr,
Beatty, Morrow,	Elson,	Kilpatrick,
Beatty, Wood,	Evans,	King,
Beyer,	Farnsworth,	Knight,
Brattain,	Farrell,	Kunkel,
Brown, Highland,	Fess,	Lambert,
Brown, Lucas,	FitzSimons,	Lampson,
Brown, Pike,	Fluke,	Leete,
Campbell,	Fox,	Leslie,
Cassidy,	Halenkamp,	Longstreth,
Cody,	Halfhill,	Ludey,
Collett,	Harbarger,	Marriott,
Colton,	Harris, Ashtabula,	Marshall,
Cordes,	Harris, Hamilton,	Matthews,
Crites,	Harter, Huron,	Mauck,
Crosser,	Henderson,	McClelland,
Cunningham,	Hoffman,	Miller, Crawford,
Davio,	Holtz,	Miller, Fairfield,
DeFrees,	Hoskins,	Miller, Ottawa,
Donahay,	Hursh,	Norris,
Dunlap,	Johnson, Madison,	Nye,
Dunn,	Jones,	Okey,

Correction of the Journal—Second Reading of Proposals, Etc.

Partington,	Shaffer,	Taggart,
Peters,	Shaw,	Tallman,
Pettit,	Smith, Geauga,	Tannehill,
Pierce,	Smith, Hamilton,	Tetlow,
Price,	Solether,	Thomas,
Read,	Stalter,	Walker,
Redington,	Stamm,	Watson,
Riley,	Stevens,	Weybrecht,
Rockel,	Stewart,	Winn,
Roehm,	Stilwell,	Wise,
Rorick,	Stokes,	Woods.

The PRESIDENT: The decision of the president is reversed and the member from Hamilton will have his vote recorded.

Mr DOTY: Before that question is made, I would like to ask the member from Hamilton [Mr. CORDES] a question. Is it not a fact that when the roll call was had you did not answer to your name and you answered to some other name?

Mr. CORDES: Sometimes the names are called rapidly. My name was called and then the name following mine was called, and just as it was called I was answering to my name.

Mr. DOTY: Then I appear to be correct—that the member did not vote when his name was called.

Mr. LAMPSON: I am satisfied that the gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. CORDES] was trying to vote.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any further corrections to be made to the journal? If not, the journal will stand approved as read.

Mr. CROSSER: During the very illuminating debate that took place yesterday on Proposal No. 54 one of the gentlemen who represents one of the morning papers reported me as saying this in debate—I don't think he intended to say that I engaged in the debate, for the members of the Convention know that is not true (reading): "They don't seem to understand," declared Delegate Crosser, "that we are the bosses of the supreme court. This Convention is over the supreme court and not they over us."

It is not a matter of great consequence. I know the gentleman who reported that had no intention of doing me any harm, but I want to call attention to the fact that I did not take any part in the debate yesterday and did not make the remarks attributed to me. More than that, if I had taken part in the debate, I have an extreme antipathy for the word "boss" and I would not have used it.

The PRESIDENT: Proposals are now in order.

SECOND READING OF PROPOSALS.

Proposal No. 118—Mr. Lampson, relative to raising the bond limit to aid in good roads.

The proposal was read as follows:

Proposal to submit an amendment to article VIII, section 1, of the constitution.—Relative to raising the bond limit to aid in good roads.

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:

ARTICLE VIII.

Section 1. The state may contract debts to supply casual deficits or failure in revenues, or to

meet expenses not otherwise provided for; but the aggregate amount of such debts, direct and contingent, whether contracted by virtue of one or more acts of the general assembly, or at different periods of time, shall never exceed seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars; and the money, arising from the creation of such debts, shall be applied to the purpose for which it was obtained, or to repay the debts so contracted, and to no other purpose whatever.

Provided, however, that the general assembly may contract debts, and authorize issues of bonds, to an amount which in the aggregate, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, shall not exceed one per cent of the grand tax duplicate of the state, for the purpose of constructing, improving, repairing or rebuilding highways within the state: Provided further, that not to exceed ten million dollars in bonds shall be issued in any one year for this purpose.

Mr. LAMPSON: I desire to move that the Convention go into the committee of the Whole on this proposal as amended, but I will yield the floor to the gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. SMITH], who wants to make a request.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: This is not the matter upon which I tried to get the floor, but could not catch the eye of the president a little while ago. It has occurred to some of the members that the procedure in this Convention ought to be outlined a little bit; therefore, with the consent of the gentleman from Ashtabula, who has the floor, I want to offer this resolution at this time if there is no objection.

Mr. DOTY: There is a question before the house.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: Have you any objection to this?

Mr. DOTY: Not at all, but there is a question before the house.

Mr. LAMPSON: If this it to provoke discussion I will not yield the floor.

Mr. DOTY: I move that the further consideration of the pending proposal be postponed five minutes. That will give the gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. SMITH] opportunity to present his matter.

The motion was carried.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: I will offer this resolution.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolution No. 64:

Be it resolved by this Fourth Constitutional Convention of the state of Ohio, That before this Convention comes to that point in its proceedings where it is necessary to vote finally on any proposal, this Convention first decide upon the manner in which it will submit all its work to the people.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: This will appear in the journal and I hope members will give it some thought. It doesn't pledge this Convention to any line of procedure, but simply establishes this principle, that before we vote finally on any proposition of any kind we first decide the manner in which we are going to submit all of our work to the people of the state of Ohio. It seems to

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

some of us that it will affect member's votes on certain measures as to whether we decide to submit in one way or the other.

The PRESIDENT: The resolution will lie over under the rule.

Mr. LAMPSON: I move that the Convention resolve itself into a committee of the Whole Convention for the purpose of considering Amended Proposal No. 118, relative to raising the bond limit to aid in the building of good roads.

The motion was carried and the president called the member from Franklin county [Mr. KNIGHT] to the chair.

In Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LAMPSON: Mr. Chairman: We are now in committee of the Whole Convention for the purpose of considering the amended proposal relative to raising the bond limit to aid in good roads, and before I proceed to explain the proposal I desire to yield temporarily for the purpose of allowing the delegate from Putnam [Mr. MATTHEWS] a member of the committee, and also the delegate from Erie [Mr. KING], another member of the committee, to present and have pending two amendments which have been recommended by the committee, so that in the debate they may be taken into consideration. I now yield the floor to the gentleman from Putnam.

Mr. MATTHEWS: I want to offer an amendment.

The amendment was read by the secretary as follows:

At the end of line 18, strike out the period and insert the following words: "and such highways shall be determined under general laws, which shall also provide for the equitable apportionment thereof among the counties."

Mr. KING: I desire to offer an amendment.

The amendment was read by the secretary as follows:

Add at the end of the section the following words: "The provisions of this section shall not be limited or controlled by section 6 of article XII."

Mr. HOSKINS: May I inquire where we can find this proposition as altered by the gentleman from Ashtabula and amended by the committee?

Mr. LAMPSON: It is Proposal No. 118, and the amendments are to strike out in line 18 at the bottom of page the word "for". That word is simply superfluous. Then on page 2 at the end of line 18 add the words, "for this purpose." As reported by the committee and with the amendments just offered by the gentleman from Putnam [Mr. MATTHEWS] and the gentleman from Erie [Mr. KING] the proposal will read as follows. I will read it slowly, so that each member can copy the amendments—

Section I. The state may contract debts to supply casual deficits or failures in revenues, or to meet expenses not otherwise provided for; but the aggregate amount of such debts, direct and contingent, whether contracted by virtue of one or more acts of the general assembly, or at different periods of time, shall never exceed seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars; and the money, arising from the creation of such debts,

shall be applied to the purpose for which it was obtained, or to repay the debts so contracted, and to no other purpose whatever.

Provided, however, that the general assembly may contract debts and authorize issues of bonds, to an amount which in the aggregate, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, shall not exceed one per cent of the grand tax duplicate of the state for the purpose of constructing, improving, repairing or rebuilding highways within the state: Provided further that not to exceed ten million dollars in bonds shall be issued in any one year for that purpose, and such highways shall be determined under general laws, which shall also provide for the equitable apportionment thereof among the counties.

The provisions of this section shall not be limited or controlled by section 6 of article XII.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, this proposal is in fact the proposal of the Federation of Good Roads. It has been unanimously recommended by the committee on Good Roads, every one of twenty-one members having signed the report. The proposal fixes the limitation of one per cent of the grand tax duplicate upon the law-making power for the purpose of aiding in the construction of good roads, and there is another limitation to the effect that not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be issued in any one year. The total tax duplicate at the present time is about \$6,500,000,000, so that one per cent. would amount to \$65,000,000, so that under this limitation, bonds for the purpose of aiding in good roads would not be outstanding at any one time, under present conditions, in excess of \$65,000,000, and not more than \$10,000,000 would be issued in any one year. I have caused to be placed upon your desks this morning a computation which has been made in the office of the auditor of state, based upon a \$50,000,000 aggregate issue, and showing about what it would cost. There are two computations upon this statement. The first computation starts in with the supposition that \$10,000,000 should be issued the first year and that the interest would be 3½ per cent per annum. The interest then would be \$350,000 for the first year, and the tax necessary to be made would be five hundred and eighty-three ten-thousandths of a mill. Upon this hypothesis none of the principal would be paid until after ten years. On the eleventh year there would be an interest account of \$1,750,000, and on the supposition that \$2,000,000 were put in a sinking fund to liquidate the bonds there would be a total amount to be raised of \$3,750,000, amounting to 75 cents per capita, or six thousand two hundred and fifty ten-thousandths of a mill—a little more than six-tenths of a mill on the dollar. You can figure out the highest rate per capita under that circulation. I think it is 73.6 and the average at the end of forty-nine years would be 49½ cents per capita each year. Now, there is another computation, based upon the issue of \$5,000,000 the first year and \$10,000,000, \$15,000,000, \$20,000,000, and on up until the \$50,000,000 point has been reached at the end of ten years, but by examination you will find that while the cost per capita starts in much lower the average is not so different.

Now, the details of the distribution of the funds re-

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

ceived from this bond issue will be left entirely with the legislature. We have not undertaken to legislate on that proposition. We have simply raised the limit and placed the mandate on the legislature to make an equitable distribution, provided the amendments that the committee has agreed to shall be adopted.

Under the present law we have provided for an inter-county system of roads and an equal distribution. That is the law now. But that law would be modified by the legislature if it saw fit to do so. Our proposition is a mandate to the legislature that there should be an equitable distribution. The progress of nations is gaged by the extension of their road systems and means of transportation and communication.

The United States has the most extensive railroad system in the world, but it is away behind European countries in its wagon roads.

Only about eight per cent. of the mileage of our wagon roads is improved.

It costs our farmers more to get their produce to the railway station often than it does to transport it to the market. Now the two systems, the railway system and the wagon road system, should go hand in hand. The wagon-road system should be made to supplement the railway system, so that the cost of getting the farmer's produce to market would be greatly lessened. Perhaps the best highway system in Europe is that of France. She began making her highways soon after the Revolution and now has a system upon which she has expended \$1,660,000,000 and the annual cost of maintenance is \$40,000,000.

Mr. MAUCK: May I interrupt the gentleman a moment? The county which I represent has been spending a great deal for making its highways. The county which the chairman of the committee represents has not spent anything. What provision is there made to cover that situation?

Mr. LAMPSON: The requirement of equitable distribution covers that.

Mr. MAUCK: But who determines that?

Mr. LAMPSON: The legislature will determine that; and the county commissioners with the state authorities will determine the details of the application.

Mr. MAUCK: But having determined the policy of issuing bonds, ought we not determine the policy of distribution?

Mr. LAMPSON: I think not, but that may be a matter about which there is difference of opinion.

Mr. WATSON: Should not that word "equitable" be stricken out and the word "equal" be put in its place?

The PRESIDENT: The gentleman from Guernsey [Mr. WATSON] is out of order. The gentleman from Ashtabula has the floor.

Mr. LAMPSON: After the Franco-Prussian war it was the wonder of the world how quickly France paid off her debt. I have no doubt that the perfection of her country highways had much to do in enabling her to liquidate that great debt to Germany.

In the United States, it is reliably estimated, that we waste \$40,000,000 a year on public roads, dirt or mud roads, and that the excessive cost of transportation from the farm to the railroad station reaches the tremendous sum of \$250,000,000 annually. The proportion of this waste every year which is borne by the citizens of Ohio

would be many times the cost which would be placed upon them by the proposed bond issue. The excessive cost of transportation of food products to the market is a large element in the high cost of living.

Last fall I was down in the country twenty-five miles from where I lived, and I went out into a large orchard and to my surprise I found the ground literally covered with beautiful apples — hundreds of bushels. I went back to the house with the farmer and asked him why it was that he was letting those splendid apples go to waste. He said, "By the time I hire labor to pick them and get them to the railroad station and from there to market the price I get for them is all gone. There is no profit."

Now, suppose that the cost of transportation to the railroad station had been lessened by means of good roads one-third or two-thirds, and statistics show that transportation over a good road is not to exceed one-third what it is over a bad road, then there would have been left a profit for the farmer on his produce.

Bad roads also seriously affect the attendance of the country school children upon the public schools. We spend millions and millions of dollars for the promotion of education. One-third to one-half of our tax rate goes for the improvement and support of our public schools, and yet statistics show that in those districts where the roads are bad, the percentage of attendance upon the public school is very much lower than where the roads are good. Ninety per cent. of the traffic upon the highways of the state is confined to less than twenty per cent. of its mileage, and of course these much traveled highways should be the ones to be improved, but as this country grows older, all of its highways will be improved, as are the highways of France, Germany, England and other foreign countries.

One of the large elements in the prosperity of our country is the home owner, whether he be a city man or a country man, and all of the people who are interested in promoting home owning are interested in facilitating transportation to and from the homes, whether in country or city.

Improved roads benefit all interests. All roads lead to the great industrial centers. This is not a question that our city friends need sheer at, because all roads lead to Cincinnati, Columbus, Cleveland, Dayton and Toledo. Not only that, but with the coming of the automobile—not only the pleasure automobile and the travel automobile, but the truck automobile—county lines are broken down. Even state lines are being broken down upon this question of good roads. We are coming, by reason of good roads, to be more and more one people. Easy communication has wrought wonders through our railroads, telegraph and telephone systems for the American people. What we are looking to now is to add to these means which we already have better roads to complete it. The manufacturer of the city is interested in transporting his products into the country as much as the farmer is interested in transporting his products into the city. Why, to my surprise, during the summer season, when roads were good in my county this year, when they were dry and hard, I began to see a great big automobile truck from a manufacturing establishment in Ashtabula going through my town ten miles south and on beyond into the country ten or fifteen miles, loaded with lumber.

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

Every day for a week that truck went down into the country loaded with lumber. It was cheaper to transport it that way than to send it on the railroad and have it unloaded on wagons and then transported into the country. The cities that have large corporations whose products are transported are therefore interested in this project, and should not hesitate to pay their share of its costs.

In 1898 New York had seventeen thousand abandoned farms. The state aid program resulted in the issue of \$50,000,000 of state bonds in 1906 under a general system of improving highways, and the latest statistics show that New York has about 975 abandoned farms.

In 1890 Massachusetts had a large number of abandoned farms. In 1892 she began her era of road construction. She now has no abandoned farms.

We all recognize that one of the problems of this period is the emigration from the country into the city, the increase of city population while the country population is almost standing still. The result of that is to largely increase the demand in the city for food products and at the same time reduce the supply that is to be furnished from the country. There you have a potent element in the high cost of living.

Labor is the largest element in this proposal. It might be denominated a labor proposal, because out of the millions that may be provided under its limitations labor will get a large share. Labor will be employed to prepare the material, to get out the stone and make the cement and transport it to the places where it is to be laid to build a highway. When the material is there, labor will be employed in the building of the highways. Not only that, but the labor of transportation over the highways in the end will be largely increased because the habit of living in the country, going to the country to live, will be largely increased. And without all of the aid which it is possible for this country to provide for the employment of labor, what do you think this country is coming to? Gentlemen, we now have in the United States, to say nothing of our island possessions, more than ninety millions of people. We have doubled our population every twenty-five years. Of course the ratio will not continue so great, but let me suggest what would happen if it did. Ninety millions now; twenty-five years from now a hundred and eighty millions; fifty years from now, three hundred and sixty millions; seventy-five years from now, seven hundred and twenty millions; and a century from now fourteen hundred and forty millions of people! Of course the ratio will not continue, but the increase in population will be tremendous, and the mighty problem of the future is to employ and feed labor, to employ it at a good wage, to provide the means of employment; and in the very building of the inter-county and inter-state system of public highways we not only employ labor, but we will employ it to do the repair work of those highways when they are all built and we have a complete system of good roads all over this country. Then the means of getting the products of the country into the greater centers of population will be vastly improved. So that this problem is a problem that reaches away into the distant future, and the gentlemen in this Convention who helped to take part in its inauguration, should they live twenty-five or fifty years, or even ten years, will be proud of their vote and act

in promoting this era of good roads. Why, speaking of labor, I once heard that great humorist, Mark Twain, describe that great industrial city of Pittsburg at night, with its flaming torches and its iron mills and its smoke stacks and its chimneys belching forth their great volumes of smoke and flame until they lighted up the very heavens and made them lurid, and at the climax of his description he said, "Why Pittsburg at night looks like hell with its lid off," and I thought, with labor hungry and out of work, that great city would look like hell with the lid on, so dense would be the gloom that would settle over that great manufacturing city.

Gentlemen, in the future, we will have Pittsburgs in this country multiplied many fold—Pittsburgs, Clevelands, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton and other great cities will be multiplied many times in their population, and this proposition of good roads for the whole people will have something to do with the promotion of prosperity for all of the people, and in preserving for us all the grandest and greatest republic on the face of the earth.

Mr. ANDERSON: Did you find that the people appearing before your committee were the men who wanted to get into the city or the men who wanted to get out from the city? Did not the main interest in good roads appear to be from those outside of the city?

Mr. LAMPSON: No; there were men appearing before the committee who represented the State Grange. The State Grange has endorsed this proposition. And there were men appearing before the committee who represented great city industries.

Mr. HARBARGER: Let me ask a question: Would the issue of these bonds be non-taxable?

Mr. LAMPSON: Under the present law they would be non-taxable and they would be issued at as low a rate as possible— $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is what the auditor of state suggested. That would, of course, depend upon the market.

Mr. PIERCE: I would like to know if the committee considered any proposal that each county construct its own roads by taxation without the issuance of bonds and make their improvements without state aid?

Mr. LAMPSON: We did not. There was no such proposal before the committee.

Mr. PIERCE: Don't you believe that this money to be expended ought to be expended by the officials of the county in which the road is constructed?

Mr. LAMPSON: I understood it would be to a large extent. The county would furnish at least half of the money and perhaps more. The state under the present law is limited to fifty per cent and the county furnishes the rest, and oftentimes more than fifty per cent.

Mr. DWYER: I would suggest an amendment to the amendment as follows: One of the amendments provides for an equitable apportionment to each county. I would add to that, "same to be expended by the county commissioners of each county."

Mr. LAMPSON: That is a matter the gentleman can offer if he wants to. We thought the legislature would look after that. We did not want to complicate our proposition with matters of pure legislation. We are laying down simple propositions. We are leaving the details to give the legislature a chance.

Mr. DWYER: I do not favor giving the state board

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

control over these funds if they are authorized to be expended. I say let the commissioners in each county control them. They know the roads and the highways of their county; they know the needs of their county, and they can spend the money apportioned to their county better than any state board. They are responsible to the people to see that it is properly expended, and there is nothing wrong in putting that in as an amendment.

Mr. LAMPSON: I am somewhat tired, and it is a little late—

Mr. MAUCK: Just a minute about the disposition of this fund, if we should be wicked enough to create such a fund. My people are a very poor people, but we have issued bonds to the extent of over \$15 per capita for every man, woman and child in our county to improve the roads in our county. The county from which the chairman of this committee comes has never done a lick of work towards improving the rural roads of that county. The trouble with this amendment is that it proposes to tax us who have already done just a little more than we are capable of doing towards the rural roads, and giving the benefit of that over to a county like Franklin that has never done anything towards improving its roads. I am therefore opposed to this resolution, unless it is accompanied with such safeguards to protect those counties that have already done something as against those counties that have done nothing.

Mr. LAMPSON: Are you not willing that the county of Franklin shall help you a little in building roads?

Mr. MAUCK: Yes; but I would like —

Mr. LAMPSON: Your tax duplicate is not more than one-fourth of what Franklin county's is.

Mr. MAUCK: We are a poor people, but we have done our best, and have done far more than some of those rich counties in the central part of the state that have done nothing. Now, if you will arrange some equitable distribution of this thing, I shall have no objection to it.

Mr. WATSON: There is no member on this floor who is more interested in the proposal to make good roads than I am, but there is one part of this proposal, the phraseology of which I do not like, and that is this "equitable distribution". If I understand the definition of that word, it brings up the contention that was on this floor in the last general assembly, whether the large counties in the state of Ohio should have the bulk of the fund, or whether it shall be equally distributed among the eighty-eight counties? If I remember the result of that conflict, it was claimed upon this floor that Cuyahoga county paid one-tenth of the taxes of the state of Ohio and should have one-tenth of that created fund. I can never subscribe to that idea if that be carried into effect in this resolution or proposition. We take it that we are building these roads on a state-wide plan. We take it that this is to be for the benefit of the whole state and not for local distribution and not for local benefit. I want to look at this road proposition from the same standpoint and from the same level that I look at the school system of the state of Ohio. That question—diverging a little from the point under discussion—has always been a bone of contention. We have always had a question as to whether the school funds should go to the one side or the other. I think that the road fund

should be equally distributed and not equitably, and when the proper time comes I shall offer that amendment.

Mr. DWYER: I want to say for the benefit of some of these gentlemen that I own a farm in Mercer county. I have already expended \$1,200 in making roads around that farm. We are building roads in that county that cost over \$4,000 a mile by the farmers being assessed along the lines of the roads for their construction. The proposition that he makes that there should not be some equitable adjustment of that would be entirely unfair. Take Montgomery county — nearly all of the county is piked. There are turnpikes everywhere. So as to Butler county. The counties in all of that section have turnpikes. Every road in the county is made a turnpike. Now, why should those counties that have already built turnpikes by assessing the property along those turnpikes — why should not they be equitably treated in any distribution of this money herein provided?

Mr. WATSON: I take it this way: That the plan under which it is proposed to build these roads is the inter-county system and that extends all over the state of Ohio, and it should not be confined to any one county or set or group of counties, but the same should be equitably distributed out over the state. And I do not think for a moment that under this plan the farmer vote in this Constitutional Convention will subscribe to any other idea than an equal distribution of that fund.

Mr. PECK: I am very glad that this proposition has been brought up early in the Convention. I am very anxious that in some proper shape it shall be adopted, and I was glad to hear the strong and forceful presentation of it by the chairman of the committee. He combines elements of a statesman and a prophet, which we are told is essential to a real statesman.

I have not a great deal to say about this proposition. I have not given it great study except that I am in favor of the proposition, and I hope the members from the country will not approach it in a haggling or selfish spirit. If they do, we won't carry anything. If every fellow grabs for his county, that is an end of it. We must approach this matter looking at it from the standpoint of the state of Ohio and not from the standpoint of the county from which each delegate comes.

The county of Hamilton has within five or six years constructed more than 500 miles of excellent turnpike roads at its own expense and without asking aid from anybody. The county of Hamilton wants this proposition, and they are not haggling about what they have done and they don't ask anything extra on account of what they have done. They simply ask to put this through for the state of Ohio. I hate to see this local spirit of jealousy springing up here. We have successfully laid aside the political devil in this Convention. He has not raised his head and we haven't had any trouble with him. Let us not let the local devil get in here. We will never agree upon anything if we do. Take this in a broad, sensible, statesmanlike way.

Mr. PIERCE: I would like to inquire if what Hamilton county has done every other cannot do?

Mr. PECK: Of course they can, but they haven't done it. The proposition you made was simply the present system, that the counties go on and build their own roads.

Mr. PIERCE: I would like to inquire also if you

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

think it necessary to issue bonds—if there is not a better way to get at the question than to issue bonds payable thirty-five years hence?

Mr. PECK: I don't know. That is the way all of these things are done. To issue bonds simply means to promise to pay early in the future. Now, the people of thirty or thirty-five years from now will all have the benefit of these roads, and there is no reason why they should not contribute something in payment for them. We give them the property and the benefits of it.

Mr. MILLER, of Fairfield: Will the general assembly do it?

Mr. PECK: We are directing the general assembly to do it and I have no doubt they will do it. The limitation of \$750,000 of public indebtedness has kept the general assembly from doing anything in the way of public improvements in this state. They couldn't do anything worthy of consideration. Why, gentlemen, the state of Ohio is a great big, prosperous, rich community that can afford to have good roads all over it, and that it has not is a shame and a reproach; just put that in your pipes and smoke it. Just go out on your country roads and see what this great big rich state with its immense tax duplicate has. You make it difficult to carry the products of the farm to the city, difficult to exchange communications between the different cities. What we want is a system of highways commensurate with the dignity and population and wealth and capacity and business of the state.

Mr. PIERCE: Let me ask one more question. You are a believer in home rule, are you not?

Mr. PECK: Certainly.

Mr. PIERCE: Why not allow each county by referendum vote to determine its method of building the roads and not make it a state matter?

Mr. PECK: Because they would determine on different methods. One county would want one method and another county would want another, and this is a state matter. We want to tie the state together by these roads. It is not a county matter; it is a state matter.

Mr. PIERCE: Where does the home rule come in?

Mr. PECK: The general assembly represents us in such matters.

Mr. WATSON: The gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. PECK] has the same idea that I have. I want to make it a state matter, but —

Mr. PECK: Well, I agree with you on that; what is your question?

Mr. WATSON: Will the "equitably" do it?

Mr. PECK: I will come to that. I don't differ much with you about that. I think that opens the door for the local selfish devil to pop in. I am afraid of the supreme court on that word equitably. You know our supreme court is wonderfully constituted. They brought in that ordinance of 1787 on us and we don't know what they will bring in. If you say "equitably distributed", who can make it? I defy any man on earth to take that fund and distribute it in such a way as will satisfy all of them. I think the proposal as written originally was much better than with the amendment, but, as I say, what we want is a state system of roads and not a Hamilton county or a Butler county system of roads. I am told by my neighbor from Brown that they have constructed an elegant system of roads in the county of Brown. We

have all been at work on the road business down in the southern part of the state, and a great deal has been done in a quiet effective way. That is all local, but our people know that more than that is needed. They don't want simply to communicate with the people of their county. The gentleman here sees only the people of Butler county apparently. Suppose he goes two or three miles from the line, don't he go over into Preble or Warren or Hamilton, just as much as he would go to see the people of his own county, and don't he want those people to come to see him? This is not a county matter; it is a state matter, and you must take a statesmanlike view of it. Let us rise like citizens of a great republic and do our duty.

Here is a state with a greater population than Scotland or Ireland, and the roads of either Scotland or Ireland would make you ashamed of your roads. We have a population equal to that of the Kingdom of Belgium, and if you would see the magnificent roads of Belgium it would make you sick to come home and travel on our roads. And we are just as able to support it as the kingdom of Belgium, and perhaps more so, and we ought to build them. It is in the interest of the farmer; it is in the interest of the laborer, and it is for the benefit of all of the state of Ohio, in whose name I appeal to you.

Mr. LAMPSON: I think we should recess until 1:30.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is out of order. The committee of the Whole cannot recess.

Mr. LAMPSON: Then I move that the committee rise and report that we have come to no conclusion.

The motion was carried.

The vice president took the chair.

In Convention.

Mr. KNIGHT: The committee of the Whole, having had under consideration Proposal No. 118—Mr. Lampson, reports back to the Convention having as yet come to no conclusion thereon.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. LAMPSON: I now move that we recess until two o'clock.

The motion was carried.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention met pursuant to recess, Vice President Fees in the chair.

Mr. DWYER: I believe in the widest discussion on this subject, involving as it does the large expenditure of the state's money, millions of dollars. I believe we ought to have the most liberal discussion on this matter, but I would suggest, if it is agreeable to the Convention, that we discuss this matter in committee of the Whole until four o'clock and then that we rise and make it a special order for two weeks from today and hear from our constituents at home through the newspapers and through the people. By doing that we can hear from the entire state. If we are not careful, we may defeat the whole constitution. I am in favor of good roads, but we must go about this thing carefully. The citizens of Ohio are very sensitive about expenditures of large amounts of money, and we must feel the pulse of the

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

people. I think we should hear from the people before we take a final vote on this matter.

Mr. PIERCE: Why not make that motion?

Mr. DWYER: I will make that motion if there is a second.

Mr. LAMPSON: The motion would not be in order. I move that the Convention resolve itself into a committee of the Whole Convention for the further consideration of the Amended Proposal No. 118, relative to raising the bond limit to aid in good roads.

The motion was seconded.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The chair would like to allow the gentleman from Montgomery to fix the time at which the committee of the Whole shall rise.

Mr. DWYER: I am willing to have it rise at four o'clock or five o'clock. I don't want to suppress debate, but after we get through this afternoon I want it laid over until some fixed time to give us an opportunity to hear from the people at home. If Mr. Lampson wants it five o'clock, I am willing.

Mr. LAMPSON: That is a matter on which I want to confer with some of the members of the committee. There is no disposition to force this matter to a conclusion without a full and free debate. As a matter of fact, you cannot do it.

The VICE PRESIDENT: You can fix the time at which you will rise.

Mr. LAMPSON: We can have a gentlemen's agreement as to the time the committee will arise, and we can do that after we get into the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT: No; you cannot.

Mr. DWYER: Will you agree that we rise at four or five o'clock.

A number of DELEGATES: Four o'clock.

Mr. LAMPSON: I do not like to agree to anything without consulting other members of the committee on Good Roads, and I shall proceed to consult them as soon as we get into the committee, but I will say that it is part of my policy all of the time to have a full and free debate. There will be no snap judgment taken.

Mr. DOTY: If at the end of whatever debate is had further discussion is wanted, you will agree to a postponement?

Mr. DWYER: I make the suggestion that we debate as long as you want to and then rise and make this a special order for two weeks from now, so that we can hear from the people at home.

Mr. LAMPSON: I will proceed to consult with members of the committee. If the gentlemen desires it, we can have unanimous consent that the committee shall rise at four o'clock.

Mr. DWYER: If it is agreeable, I will ask the chair to put the question to the committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT: We are in the Convention, and you can fix the time in which the debate will close in the committee of the Whole. You cannot do that while in the committee of the Whole except by a vote to rise, and if the gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] will permit the Convention to vote on closing debate this afternoon at four o'clock in the committee of the Whole, the chair will put the motion.

Mr. LAMPSON: Agreed.

The VICE PRESIDENT: All in favor of limiting

this session of the committee of the Whole to four o'clock signify by saying aye and the contrary no.

It was agreed to unanimously.

The VICE PRESIDENT: Now the question is upon the motion to go into committee of the Whole.

The motion was carried.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The chair will designate the gentleman from Franklin county [Mr. KNIGHT] as chairman of the committee of the Whole.

In Committee Of The Whole.

Mr. MARSHALL: I did not get into the Convention until after the Convention was called to order, but from what I gathered it was suggested that we defer a final action on this matter until we can hear from the people at home.

Our people down at home are divided on the question of good roads. We have three papers down home and I intend to send them three copies of this computation, if I can get them, and let them publish them and educate the people on what it costs, and then we can find out what the people in each county want and it will help all of us in knowing how to cast our vote. Personally I am in favor of good roads, but I see by this calculation that the farmer who pays taxes on the valuation of \$10,000 will pay a tax of \$4.13. That is a small matter and I do not think the farmers will object to it. By doing as has been suggested, deferring this and letting the matter be laid before the people, it may save this good roads proposition from defeat in the end. I am in perfect harmony with what the Judge was saying. If you can secure enough of these so that each member can send them home to his county paper, accompanied by a letter, and get them published, it will educate the people of Ohio on this proposition before we take a final vote on it.

Mr. ANTRIM: I do not believe there is any member of this Convention more in favor of good roads than I am, and by good roads I mean capitalized words, heavily underscored. But I am not in favor of the proposition of the gentleman of Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] for the reason that I think the federal government should take the initiative. We shall make a failure of the whole matter unless this should happen.

I am well aware of the fact that there are several states in the Union that have issued bonds for good roads, but not a sufficient length of time has elapsed to test the matter, so that we cannot yet tell whether it will be successful — whether the issuing of bonds in New York and Massachusetts will work out successfully or not. Time alone will tell.

I am in favor of the federal government taking the initiative for several reasons, and I am going briefly to mention these reasons.

In the first place, I think we shall agree that no great system of roads in the history of the world was ever built that was not built by a government. I know yesterday we had a statement made regarding sacred history that was somewhat incorrect, so we should be careful in making statements as to secular history.

If we go back to the time when the good roads movement started, we shall find that there has been in the history of the world no great system of good roads

 Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

that has ever been backed by anything but a national government. Go back to the time when Rome inaugurated her system of good roads, a number of centuries before Christ, and it was Rome that built those roads, roads that cost from \$30,000 to \$100,000 a mile, roads that were built so well that they have come down to the present time.

Then come down to the time of Charlemagne, and we have a government backing the good roads. Then come on to the time of Napoleon and we have the beginning of the great modern good roads movement. In fact, in the day of Napoleon France was as far advanced in the matter of good roads as we are at the present time in this country.

Now, in the second place, I made the statement that the federal government should take the initiative. The first question that suggests itself is, is the federal government able to take the initiative in the matter of good roads, not only in Ohio, but for the whole of the forty-eight states of the Union? I think we shall all agree that we are abundantly able to do this.

In our island possessions, particularly the Philippines, we find that the federal government has already spent \$3,000,000 on good roads. We find that it has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in some other of our island possessions. How much has it spent here at home in the United States? Ten thousand dollars has been appropriated.

In the next place, we all know that the United States has the best system of railways in the world. That was brought out this morning by the first speaker, and we have the worst system of roads. We have the best system of railways largely because of government aid. Away back in the beginning the government aided these railway systems and the result is they have developed into systems that are the marvel and wonder of the civilized world.

Again, the government expends annually millions of dollars on waterways and rivers and harbors. Some insignificant harbors have as much spent on them as it would take to pike the whole of any county in Ohio, and yet those harbors are, relatively speaking, very unimportant.

Again, we are spending millions of dollars annually on federal buildings. Why, out in Wyoming, where they have about as many people as some of the small counties of Ohio, they have spent enough for federal buildings almost to pike the whole state of Ohio.

Again, our rural free delivery men and our star route men travel in the course of one year, 7,500,000 miles on the roads of the country, and nobody can estimate what the wear on American roads is for that many miles of travel. And yet the government does not expend one cent towards keeping up those roads. The matter of debt was mentioned this morning. The gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] said that France liquidated the great debt she had to pay as the result of the Franco-Prussian war very quickly. She had to pay Germany at that time, I believe, about a billion dollars. Now the entire debt of the United States is only a billion dollars — less than the debt of New York city. The debt of France, with a little over one-third of the population of this country and only one-fifteenth as large, is nearly six billions. So that it can be easily seen that if the federal

government only decides to do it, it can easily finance a good roads movement that would mean good roads for this entire country of three million square miles. I understand there are twelve good road bills before congress at the present time, and that is one reason why I am opposed to this whole proposition. What I want is that the federal government should take the lead and then that the states of this Union should co-operate with the federal government, and by the two working together there is no doubt in my mind that we shall eventually have good roads such as they have all over civilized Europe.

Now, a point that I have already briefly mentioned: I believe that we should fail without federal aid. In France they have 350,000 miles of road. The gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] tells us these roads cost \$1,660,000,000, and I think that is right. He must have looked up the same authority I did. The upkeep of these roads, and that is an important question that I shall deal with a moment later, amounts to \$41,000,000 a year, a little more than he said. I believe he said \$40,000,000. Now let us take Ohio and make a new comparison. In Ohio we have in round numbers 100,000 miles of road? If we should pike this 100,000 miles as France or Germany or England is piked, do you know how much it would cost? Figure a bit on the matter and you will find it would cost about \$400,000,000. What is a paltry \$65,000,000 compared with \$400,000,000, and what I contend for is this, when we go into this work let us go into it to build good roads. A streak of gravel or stone is not any more a good road than two streaks of rust is a railroad. When we go into it let us go into it for keeps and build roads that will endure.

If we were to issue bonds to the extent of \$65,000,000 we could pike in the neighborhood of 10,000 miles. As I figure it, the inter-county roads would amount to about 10,000 miles. So with that sum we could simply pike the inter-county roads of this state.

Now, what about the upkeep? In France they have between twenty-three and twenty-four thousand miles of government roads. Those are the finest roads in the whole country. The upkeep of those twenty-three or twenty-four thousand miles of roads is \$6,000,000 annually. I do not figure much higher for this country, though everything costs more here. If the upkeep of these 23,000 miles of roads amounts to \$6,000,000 annually then the 10,000 miles of road in this state would undoubtedly cost at the very lowest \$3,000,000. So if it is going to cost us \$3,000,000 to keep up just 10,000 miles of road, where are we going to come out with our bond issue, and how are we going to be able to pay for our bonds?

There is another matter that enters into the situation, and that is the automobile. Automobiles are a new factor in this country. We haven't tested them to know what effect they will have on the roads? We have no statistics. In France there are some, and they know about what the wear and tear of an automobile on a road is. But in this country we know nothing about it, and the automobiles are increasing yearly and are getting heavier and we see hundreds of them going through every county. There is no question about the fact that automobiles are very hard on the roads. I have had for seven years experience with an automobile, and I know

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

that an automobile wears out a road to a greater extent than any loaded wagon driven on the pike. This is a matter that ought to be considered, and considered very carefully, before we go into the matter of a bond issue. Last year there was a great automobile truck contest. The trucks started from the city of Chicago and came to Ohio through Indiana. There were perhaps twenty or twenty-five or thirty trucks. Some of them had five or six tons on them and others a lesser amount of weight, and then there were a great many automobiles with them carrying passengers. How much do you think that great number of automobiles affected the roads of the country in the two or three hundred miles they passed over in going back to Chicago? I think it would be a safe estimate to say that in their trip they injured the roads to the extent of five or six thousand dollars. That is a matter we must take into consideration in the issuing of bonds, the maintaining and keeping up of our roads.

In the next place, there are some counties not ready to be taxed. I want to speak with reference to a few counties in Northwestern Ohio, where I am best acquainted. Eleven counties in Northwestern Ohio have issued bonds for good roads to the extent of \$16,500,000. That is the exact amount, the figures having been obtained from the commissioners of those counties a few weeks ago when they were here at an annual convention. How much of this has been paid off? This is an important question, and that is the reason why we are not ready in that part of the state to issue bonds and pay more taxes for roads. These eleven counties are still eight or nine million dollars in debt for good roads. Take my own county, with which I am more familiar of course than with any other county. In the last fifteen years we have issued more than \$1,500,000 for good roads — we have four hundred square miles — \$700,000 of that has been paid off and \$800,000 is still outstanding against the county. There are farmers in that county today who are paying heavier pike taxes than they are paying on their land. There is one man that I particularly remember who is paying \$10 or \$15 a year more pike taxes than he pays on his land, and the land is appraised at over \$100 an acre. So you can see that hundreds and almost thousands of farmers in Van Wert county are not ready for a bond issue and to be taxed more heavily than they have been. And I can say for some of the adjoining counties, of these eleven counties, that they are no more ready for a big state bond issue than we are. Take even one per cent; that would mean we would have to pay \$450,000 principal in Van Wert, and the interest according to this table, would be \$35,000. And Van Wert county would have to pay state taxes amounting to \$700,000 or \$800,000 for her pikes in addition to what she is already paying; and we are issuing bonds right along. We expect in a few years to have every road in Van Wert county piked.

As I said in the beginning, notwithstanding all of these facts I am heartily in favor of good roads, but I wanted to give a few estimates to supplement the estimates of the gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON]. He quoted one man and I shall quote another about hauling the produce of the farmer to the village. One authority says there is a loss as the result of poor roads of \$250,000,000. Secretary Wilson says the loss is \$300,000,000. We have been told there are only eight per cent of the

improved roads in the country that are fit for an automobile to go over. So there are \$300,000,000 loss in handling the crops. Another estimate that I get from another source, but I won't vouch for it, is that we lose \$300,000,000 in depreciation on motors, animals and vehicles on account of poor roads. Then there are \$300,000,000, we are told by one authority, added to the cost of living as the result of our having such poor roads. Another authority adds \$100,000,000 for incidentals, and we have a grand total of one billion dollars lost in this country as the result of poor roads.

I am in favor of good roads, but the thing I contend for is this: Let us wait until the federal government takes the initiative, and then, when the federal government co-operates with the state government, the time will soon come when we shall have almost as good roads as they have in some of the civilized countries of Europe.

Mr. LAMPSON: Does not the gentleman think that when national aid is proffered it will be upon the condition that the states themselves furnish a large percentage of the money, and ought we not to be in position to get our share?

Mr. ANTRIM: I think the states ought to be ready and willing and enthusiastic to do their share.

Mr. LAMPSON: To get our share, I said.

Mr. ANTRIM: To do our share; but I do not think they should make a move until the federal government has taken the initiative. I think we should embody something in this constitution that will enable us to go ahead and bind ourselves at the proper time, but it should be contingent on the federal government.

Mr. LAMPSON: If we leave the constitution as it is and two years from now, as is now said by some of the advocates of good roads, national aid is extended, how can we get our share? We shall be unable to comply with the conditions upon which the national aid shall be proffered.

Mr. ANTRIM: Is it not possible for us to remove this bond issue limit and be ready to issue bonds just as soon as the federal government takes the initiative?

Mr. LAMPSON: If I am allowed to reply, that is exactly what we are proposing.

Mr. ANTRIM: But I do not want to do anything until the federal government takes the initiative, and we should make what we do dependent on what the federal government does.

Mr. LAMPSON: The whole matter will be up to the legislature. The fact that we raise the limit does not make them issue the bonds. If the legislature wants to wait for the national government to act, it can do so.

Mr. ANTRIM: But it won't do it.

Mr. HARRIS, of Hamilton: I want to address the house very briefly on this subject. The gentleman from Van Wert [Mr. ANTRIM] with rare delicacy has referred to the fact that yesterday in my reference to the Old Testament I quoted the wrong authority. The gentleman from Van Wert [Mr. ANTRIM] is absolutely right, but there are extenuating circumstances. I am a member of the committee on Taxation, and for a couple of days we have had a strenuous debate on city property, and it is the most natural thing that I should carry in my mind the word Lot. The wonder was that I didn't refer to that gentleman as City Lot. But this morning I took

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

up my Bible, something I fear none of the other delegates has with him, and I turned to the nineteenth chapter of Genesis and saw that it was Abraham who interceded with the Lord in behalf of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Mr. NORRIS: If the gentleman has by inadvertence misquoted the Scripture, why cannot this Convention amend the Scripture so as to make his quotation correct?

Mr. HARRIS, of Hamilton: As a layman I would not have any objection to that, but what would our supreme court say to it? But I want to say that Abraham was an ancestor of mine, and I do not object to his getting full credit for the intercession.

I make this statement in order to wipe away the tears of the Muse of History, who would take so much to heart the misquotation referred to.

Now, in reference to this matter of good roads, I would ask—and it is purely an inquiry from the very best of motives—whether the gentleman from Van Wert [Mr. ANTRIM] was accurate in one of his statements? As I understood him, his statement was that the federal government has erected in the state of Wyoming federal buildings the cost of which has been in excess of what piking the entire state of Ohio would be. Did I understand him to make that statement?

Mr. ANTRIM: I was speaking in hyperbole in that particular reference — a figure of speech.

Mr. HARRIS, of Hamilton: I do not object to hyperbole in some things, but in the matter of taxation hyperbole is entirely out of order. I am heartily in favor of this good roads bill, but I fear it is a little too indefinite. If I am correctly informed the grand tax duplicate is \$6,000,000,000. So that the limit would be \$60,000,000, instead of \$50,000,000. The grand tax duplicate has been increased in the last year by the state tax commission from \$2,500,000,000 to \$6,000,000,000. Now, it is reasonable to suppose that if the tax commission within the last year could make such an increase as that, that within the next few years the grand tax duplicate will be ten or fifteen billion dollars. I call attention to the fact that after the tenth year under this example that has been furnished us by the auditor of state—that during the proposed life of the bonds, thirty-five years—commencing with the eleventh year there would be about \$2,000,000, and in the twenty-five years of the remaining life there would be about \$50,000,000, and under this example \$50,000,000 more bonds could be issued, because the issue could be one per cent of the duplicate. Now if the grand duplicate should be increased from \$6,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000 you could readily see that the amount of bonds that could be issued would be increased \$50,000,000 above the proposed maximum of \$50,000,000, because one per cent of a grand tax duplicate of \$10,000,000,000 would be \$100,000,000, and at the end of twenty-five years owing to the amortization scheme there would probably be another \$100,000,000, making a total of \$200,000,000. I only call your attention to those bonds so that the committee can consider some definite propositions, because I favor the principle of the measure being incorporated into the constitution, but I believe that the state of Ohio will be likely to repudiate the entire proposition at the polls if there is such a wide margin for the expenditure of public money. I would therefore suggest that they fix a maximum amount of \$50,-

000,000 or \$60,000,000, if in their judgment this sum would be required, but let the maximum debt to be created be clearly specified in the proposal.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I do not think the objection made by the gentleman who has just taken his seat is a valid one. We simply allow the legislature to levy so much tax. The legislature can take care of that. I trust the legislature will have some reason and discretion in levying this tax.

As for myself, I live in a small county, probably one of the smallest in the state, and if this fund were distributed according to the area of the counties of the state, we would probably get as little of this money as any other county. But I think that would probably be the better basis upon which to divide this fund. We live away off in the eastern part of the state, in the blue grass region. We need roads badly and I feel very much like supporting this bill. I do not know how we will ever build roads unless we here provide money to do it, and I know of no other or better way to do it than the way provided by this proposal.

I will admit that the roads we have been constructing all over the state are not satisfactory, and if we can not get any better roads built under this state plan than have been built in a good many counties by the authorities thereof, I would not vote a dollar for this purpose. But I believe, and that is one of the reasons why I support this proposal, that the state in connection with the counties will inaugurate a better system of roads and make better construction than we have been having heretofore. I am in favor of this because we need the roads, and, as I said before, I believe we can get a better system. I believe we can inaugurate a better system all over the state and build roads with less expense and build them better. As I said before, if we can't build them right, don't build them at all. That is my doctrine, and I believe it is the true rule to apply to all public business. If you can't build a public structure or a public road right, don't build it at all; wait until you are able to build it right.

Mr. ANTRIM: How much do you think it would cost to build a mile of road in the state of Ohio and do it right?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: I think we can build a mile of road in my county of brick so that it would last for fifty years without much repair for \$9,000 or \$10,000 a mile.

Mr. ANTRIM: Well, how many miles would \$65,000,000 build?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: It makes no difference how many. It will build some; we will have made a commencement, and the money will not have been wasted.

As I said before, as to the division of this fund, I would prefer myself, although it would be against my county, that it should be divided proportionately to the area of the several counties.

Now, as very properly remarked by the gentleman from Hamilton county [Mr. PECK], this is a matter that interests the whole state of Ohio. It doesn't apply to Harrison county or to Franklin county or to any one county more than to any other county. It has been said that Cuyahoga county pays one-tenth of the whole taxes of the state of Ohio. I don't know whether that is correct or not, but I have no reason to doubt it. Has Cuya-

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

hoga county any interest in the good roads of Harrison county? I say yes, and I will tell you why. We have had some experience that way. We have thirty miles of turnpike road leading from the east side to the west side of our county pointing directly towards Cuyahoga county, and in the summer season there is not a half hour of the day that we haven't automobiles filled with the citizens of Cuyahoga county going over the turnpike road, and the truth about it is they have substantially worn it out; therefore I have not any modesty about asking them to help us repair that road. We are glad to have them with us. They have nice automobiles, and the ladies who travel in them are especially handsome. I have not so much to say for the men. I won't make any remark about them. But I freely say that there are ten times as many persons traveling from the northern part of the state down to us over this road as there are of our own citizens traveling over the same, and they have substantially worn it out in five years. Why should they not help a little to repair it?

Mr. DWYER: Allow me to suggest a question: You are counting the cost of making a brick road?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, sir.

Mr. DWYER: I submit to any gentleman here who is familiar with the subject that you cannot lay a brick road for less than \$1.50 a yard. The cities are paying that much for brick streets; that is the lowest they can get a street with a concrete foundation and a brick surface. Now, you would make your road at least sixteen feet wide and a mile would be 5280 feet long; so there would be 9386 yards at \$1.50 a yard, which makes \$14,079 a mile. You cannot build a street in the city for less than that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Well we don't need a road sixteen feet wide for our country roads. More than that, I suppose you pave your streets in your city using a curb. We would not put in a curb, but by taking an interlocking brick, do away with the curb on both sides, which would be a saving of \$2,000 per mile.

Mr. DWYER: But I didn't figure on the curb at all. I was simply figuring on the street.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Well, of course, we in the country would not want the foundation you would have to use in the city where heavy traffic is handled. But we have estimates right now in our county for a road at a great deal less estimate than the gentleman from Montgomery [Mr. DWYER] says it costs them. And we are going to build it right now. We are contracting for it at this time, and we are not going to wait for federal aid. If you wait for federal aid, you will never have any roads; I think I can safely say that to you. Suppose you have the federal aid, where will the federal aid go to? Texas, in the extreme end of this country is seven times as large as Ohio, and you will pay for seven miles down there when you get one up here. What is the use of waiting for federal aid?

Mr. ANTRIM: In the event we have federal aid, do you not think the money will be equitably divided?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: What right have you to say we will have federal aid? You have twelve bills, you say, in the congress of the United States looking to that end, but there is every sort of buncombe bill in the congress of the United States. Every member introduces a bill that will make him votes in his district, never ex-

pecting it to pass. As I understand it, the senator from Cuyahoga county, Mr. Burton, is opposed to any federal aid in Ohio or anywhere else.

Now I do not believe we ought to wait for that. The Lord helps those who help themselves. He is on the side of the heavy battalion, and if you help yourself, He will help you, and if the government of the United States finds that the state of Ohio is willing to spend its money freely to build roads, it is more likely to help it than if you were not making a move in that direction.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: I think every one recognizes that it is necessary to begin some movement to improve the roads in connection with the general consensus of opinion that we must all come back to the soil to secure a living. According to persons who have investigated the matter, it will not be longer than fifty years until the great business of securing coal from the earth will be almost at an end at a price that is easy of attainment. The question of depending on the forests of the country is almost a thing of the past now. The ores of the country are fast disappearing, and we have only one source of permanent supply for the maintenance of the people of this country and that is the fertility of the soil. The tendency of the people now is to center in the largely populated districts and to neglect the only source from which we may in the future expect to derive our living. So it behooves this country and those who are responsible for its management to begin processes now by which, when completed, we can have access to the source of life for the people. It has become a very serious matter. I believe in good roads, for if we get them we have one of the means of bringing us in contact with the only means we have left for the maintenance of our millions and hundreds of millions of people that it is predicted will be inhabiting this country within a hundred years. Then the question of securing the best means for the attainment of those things resolves itself into this question of good roads.

But I believe this proposed plan is very seriously defective on the ground that it is now a rule with the legislature of this state to proffer state aid to the counties for the building of roads when it can secure from the county a percentage of the whole expense of that road. I believe under the present law it is fifty per cent. And I submit that many of the poor counties of the state, and there are a great many, are already taxed heavily, and will be taxed too heavily if they are asked to furnish as much as fifty, forty or even twenty-five per cent of the expenditure necessary to make the roads, and it will impoverish and perhaps bankrupt many of the counties of this state. I understand that Perry county has exhausted its coal—largely its great source of maintenance. Roads have been built in that county as well as in other counties. Large expenditures have been put upon the roads, and no provision has been made for the maintenance of those roads and they have been washed away. Now they need these good roads, and the state should build them; I think that we should put a provision in this constitution that the legislature should not require from any county more than a small percentage of the expense of building these roads. In fact, I think the state itself ought to build the roads, and then have some means of taxing the counties for their maintenance. The original cost of these roads in eleven

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

counties, was, I believe, \$16,000,000 as reported by the gentleman from Van Wert [Mr. ANTRIM], and if they are as hilly counties as mine, I have no doubt that as much as \$14,000,000 of that money has already washed away. I think measures should be provided—but I presume that is purely a legislative matter, but nevertheless it ought to be considered in this Convention—measures should be provided for the upkeep of the road as is done in France. I have traveled in France a good deal, and in Holland, Belgium and Switzerland—in nearly all of the countries of Europe. I was in Belgium all of last winter, and I saw many miles of roads that would have cost, according to the prices we pay in this country, as much as \$15,000 per mile. Those people are poor people, but they built those roads. And that is the muddiest country in the world except Holland. I saw a two-year old Belgian mare pulling five tons a distance of two miles in the winter time, and had the wheel gone off the pike it would have sank over the hub, while the the horse would probably have been buried.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Madison: Speaking of muddy roads, were you ever in Van Wert county?

Mr. DWYER: I have no interest in Van Wert county, but they have very fine roads there. They have pikes, and on the side of the pike they have another driveway that is not a pike. They have a double road, and I say they have the best roads in the state of Ohio, although I have no interest in the county.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: Of course in that part of Ohio we have swamps and sluiceways that of necessity make the building of roads expensive. But in Belgium and Holland, some of those countries over there, the land is lower than the sea, and they had to make foundations to stand; but nevertheless they built the roads. Having secured them they are in a position where the people are happy and prosperous and they are gaining rapidly in population, and that would be impossible without their good roads.

I only wish to emphasize my feelings about the necessity of building the roads, and also my conception of the necessity for the state paying almost all the expense of it, for I do believe that there are a few counties in the state of Ohio that would be bankrupt by furnishing fifty per cent of the expenses, and there would be enough of those counties I think to defeat the constitution if we put in a provision that would thus affect them. I think the legislature should be directed to require the county to pay only a minimum amount toward the expense of building the roads. I wish to suggest in that connection, if any one thinks that would be an injustice to the state, that there are hundreds and thousands of connecting roads between the state roads that would be taken care of by the county that would be concomitant to and feeders of the state road, and if we charge any poor county any considerable per cent of the necessary expense to build the road they would be unable to make the other roads connecting with this road, and our big state road will be of small value without the connecting roads.

Mr. STAMM: I think we should have federal aid in building the roads, but we are not here as a federal body. We are here as a constitutional convention of the state of Ohio to provide basic laws for the next twenty years, and we can hardly afford to wait until the national government will build the roads for us. The gentle-

man has said that the roads of Europe are altogether under the supervision of the government. That is true, but the roads are classified there. They have the public thoroughfares—the main road—supported by the government; then the second class roads which are principally supported by the counties or districts or municipalities. It is said that centralization of government is built upon the autonomy of the states, and the states must do for themselves until the centralized government can come to their aid.

Now as to this idea that we should have each township or county build its roads, we have had that system for years and what is the result? We generally find a mile of good road, and then three or four miles of mud road. Home rule seems to be adopted. The cities pave their own streets and the counties build their own roads, but sometimes the cities contribute towards the county roads. But I think we must have the supervision of the state. I think probably the legislature will be obliged to classify the roads, and define which roads are to be assisted.

Mr. REDINGTON: I want to align myself on the side of good roads, and I am heartily in favor of this proposal going as far as it does. I am somewhat surprised that most of our delegates representing rural districts are not willing to be helped by some of their city friends. We have heard somewhere that the meek and lowly will inherit the earth. My observation has been that the beef-eating, whiskey-drinking fellow gets a whole lot out of the world. I believe in push and energy. Here is a proposition that puts the people of Ohio in a position to get something when the time comes. This is simply an action on the part of the Convention to authorize the legislature to do something. It stops there. It does not compel the legislature to do it. The legislature will act when it sees fit. I shall be sorry to see this Convention adjourn without taking any action on this matter. If the Convention were going into the details, there are many things in my mind that I would like to discuss as to the manner of spending the money, in the division of the money, and how long the bonds are to run, as to whether the bonds will outlive the usefulness of the road, and all sorts of things of that kind, but it seems that we are cut off from that part of the debate. The proposition is simply shall we authorize the legislature in its own way to issue bonds that the roads may be built sometime, whether the federal government sees fit to assist or otherwise? I am satisfied, as the gentleman has stated, that if we wait until the federal government comes to our aid on the matter of good roads, some of us will have gone hence, and I would like to see good roads in Ohio in my lifetime. I know from the manner in which the federal government proceeds in building postoffices and other public buildings that their promises are a good long time maturing, and if the people of this day and age want good roads they had better set about helping themselves and start at it now. Therefore, I wish to go on record as being in favor of this proposition.

Mr. McCLELLAND: We started off yesterday with a magnificent debate. We followed it up this morning with speeches from judges and lawyers. We applauded to the echo, and we had reason to do so, not only because of the ability of the speakers, but because of the principles they advocated. Yet I could not help feeling that

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

we farmers ought to have our little say, and that the judges and lawyers ought to give the men who are not accustomed to talking an opportunity to express their feelings about the matter. The Convention will bear in mind too that we farmers are not accustomed to laying down the law with the assurance that we are right and beyond dispute as are the judges. Perhaps you will pardon us if our speeches are largely questions. We are accustomed to that line of getting information, just as the lawyers are, and so accustomed are they to do this that they can hardly keep their seats when a speaker is up, and it is difficult for them to refrain from putting embarrassing questions to him. We are accustomed to that method ourselves of handling matters, so when we get into this thing we shall probably have some questions.

This morning it was said that this proposition originated with the Good Roads Association—I won't say originated, but that it was suggested. But it has seemed strange to me that after getting along for sixty years with a limitation of debt of \$750,000 we should at one bound authorize an issue of bonds by the state to the extent of \$50,000,000 for one single purpose. How soon will some other interest bob up and ask to be allowed to issue a like amount of bonds? How does it come that just after the tax duplicate came out considerably over double the last duplicate—how does it happen that in this transition period of the state's history this matter should be sprung and a demand made for it by a well organized bureau, and every candidate for election, from the time his name was announced, was asked to commit himself to bonding the state for \$50,000,000, not because it was the will of the Convention or the will of the state, but because it was the desire of the association which proclaimed itself a Good Roads Association, but which was actually the Automobile Association of the state? I have talked to the officers and I know whereof I speak. I know they appointed on the committee men who were not owners of automobiles or members of the automobile association, but the initiative was with that association, and they simply selected those outside of the association who would work in harmony with them and who were favorable to their plans.

I recognize the fact that the automobiles have come to stay, and that we must change our system of roads; that in view of that fact we must have better roads than we have had heretofore, and it is clear to every person who has given it any thought that we must have the good roads. But this estimate which comes to us in the proposal by the member from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON] and which has the indorsement of the Good Roads committee, is the estimate of what the Automobile Association of the state wants. Now this estimate is just like all other estimates furnished by interested parties. All of our county commissioners know that when an enthusiast sends up an estimate of what is desired, he puts it at the top figure, and that it ought to be scaled down. We know that all over the state our commissioners are scaling down the estimates of even conservative men. Why then is it necessary for this Convention to adopt at once and unquestioned the enthusiastic estimates of those who, on the whole, won't have the bills to pay?

Now the owners of automobiles have not been paying their share of the expenses of those roads. The stone pikes of the state don't stand that kind of traffic. We

are told that some of them that were built five years ago are worn out. If we go on building these stone turnpikes, the big steel-tired vehicles grind the roads into dust, the rubber-tired ones come along and take the dust off and the road is gone in a short time. We know the only thing as yet discovered that will stand is vitrified brick, but that is so expensive as to be prohibitive. Is it not moving a little fast for us old farmers to at once commit ourselves to the legislature being permitted to bond the state for \$50,000,000, \$10,000,000 a year, for its roads, under the guidance of the Automobile Association? You may call it the Good Roads Association or the Automobile Association; it is all the same thing.

Now, what material will we use? We are afraid to say. Who will manage the expenditure? We would like to find out a good deal about that. I think it is well that those who foot the bill should know something about it before they vote the expenditures. A five-dollar tax on automobiles won't pay the bills.

Mr. NORRIS: If by some arrangement the funds here could be equitably divided and so placed and so procured that my county, which has spent two million and a half for pikes, would not have to go over to your county and pay a like amount for you, would not the proposition be a good one? After we have built 700 miles of pike in my county, we ought not to have to go over to some other county and build 700 miles of pike there.

Mr. McCLELLAND: I am not arguing on that matter. I am simply asking whether it is wise to allow the legislature at one bound to expend \$50,000,000.

But they also state that the scheme involves, if carried out, not only bonding the state for \$50,000,000, but that the counties would be expected to meet the appropriation made to their counties by a like sum, thereby burdening the counties with an additional amount. Where are we going to stop? What other bonds have to be issued, and how long will these roads endure? We are in an experimental stage, and it is not well to do too much experimenting. I might be ready to vote for half of the sum recommended by this committee, but I doubt very seriously the wisdom of voting the whole amount. Finally, the plans submitted by the Good Roads-Automobile Association will break down all that which the farmers and real estate owners in the state have been working for, to keep taxation within reasonable limits, for we feel that the counties have already reached the limit of taxation under any reasonable tax law, and to make this increase in state and county taxes, and perhaps the issue of township bonds, will break down the whole fabric we have been so carefully constructing in the one per cent. tax law.

Mr. DWYER: I move that we extend the discussion until five o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is out of order. The committee of the Whole has no power over that matter. It discusses until a motion to rise is carried.

Mr. TALLMAN: I have a farm and I have a law office. I stay most of the time in the law office. Perhaps I made a mistake. I sometimes think I ought to have stayed on the farm. It is possible that a good farmer was spoiled in making a poor lawyer.

As I view this matter, it is the consensus of opinion among all the delegates here that we should have better

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

roads. Only one thing seems to be a matter of discussion, and that is as to some of the details—how is the fund to be divided, who will disburse the fund, who will have charge of it, who will look after it? If that came within our province to determine it would be the most inconvenient thing that could happen to our constitution, and particularly the most unfortunate thing that could happen to our prospects of obtaining good roads in the state of Ohio by any amendment to our constitution. Take all the delegates here, and there are not probably two of them who could possibly agree upon some of the details. If we put in the details we simply transfer the controversy that is upon this floor to the people of the state, and they will differ about the method of distribution, and they will differ about whether the county should pay the tax, or whether some of the poorer counties should be helped or not. With so many differences of opinion where would the support come from to carry this constitution? Any time we go into details in this constitution we are raising up enemies. The people of the state can no more agree on details than can this Convention. But if the simple matter is left to the people of the state whether they shall have a state issue of bonds, with a provision for the payment of those bonds by a state tax levied as other state taxes are levied, leaving it to the legislature to fight out the details, then the people from Perry county, Highland county and every other county in the state who are in favor of good roads can vote for that clause in the constitution; but if we burden it down with details, if we undertake in the least respect to invade their domain, any proposition that we submit to the people will be voted down.

Mr. ANDERSON: Does the gentleman regard those things that are to obtain for years to come as organic law or as statutory matters? In other words, those things in which there can be no change for fifty years—does the gentleman object to writing them into the organic law?

Mr. TALLMAN: What we write in is organic law. If we issue bonds they will stay until paid off. Giving to the legislature the power to do certain things is organic law, but when we undertake to go into details and tell the legislature how to do this, that and the other thing, that is legislative. If we put a thing in the constitution it can not be changed. If we refer it to the legislature, they may make several trials before they get the proper method. One law may not work equitably, and the next legislature will change it. I believe the history of our legislation shows that it is a pretty good law that lasts longer than two or three years.

Mr. ANDERSON: Was it legislation yesterday when we voted a limit on the legislature with reference to the number of jurors? Was that organic or statutory?

Mr. TALLMAN: Certainly it was organic. The legislature had no power to allow less than the whole twelve of the jury to make a verdict, and we passed an organic law for the purpose of allowing them that power. The power under our present constitution was not in them, but was prohibited, as has been interpreted by our courts.

Mr. DUNN: This is a very important question, and we ought not to make undue haste in its consideration. It is possible there are some of the members of this Convention who seldom speak that might perhaps give you a new thought on this subject.

I have been greatly interested in good roads ever since boyhood. When I was quite a young man I was connected with the building of a long turnpike. Sixty-five years ago my father was at the head of a company of fifty men building roads in Ireland. I know something of the fine roads and highways in that island, and I know a little of the foundation of the good roads system in France.

Some one has suggested today that this whole matter be left to the county. I see this objection to that. I know that we have had some very poor road building in Ohio under the control of the county commissioners, and sometimes particularly poor roads have been built under the direction of so-called engineers who knew nothing or very little about road building. If the same system prevails in the future that has in the past, the outlook is not favorable.

I know in my county in Southern Ohio we have been building roads for eighty years under different laws. We have been going down into the very bottom of the valleys, and up over the hills and around the little crooks and turns, and we are building the roads for the present, and not for the future. We have been building the bridges twice as long as necessary. The bridge companies of this state have grafted on us. They have sold us bridges twice as long as we needed. They practically sold us two bridges where one would have done. Then, too, the county commissioners, for personal reasons, have sometimes laid down a road around a crook for fear of losing a vote or two, and so are compelling the public to travel around those crooks for the next several hundred years, or to the end of time, because they didn't want to lose a vote in the next election. We have actually graded roads on top of hills higher than the general surface of the land. I am in hopes that if we unite with the state a better system will obtain in the future, and that we shall build roads as straight as possible and with very light grades. Only two or three years ago I knew of a horse that burst a blood vessel in pulling up a grade that was three or four times as heavy as it should be. Our grades on the hills are a disgrace to our present day civilization, and if by uniting with the state we can have scientific road building I would be in favor of that. I am sure that we are grateful to men like the gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. PECK] and the members from the large cities for their unselfishness in this matter. If there are about three-fourths of the wealth of the state in those cities and in the large corporations it looks generous to us in the rural districts to have so much help in building our roads.

But there is one thing that troubles me, and that is a bond issue. If there is anything of which farmers are afraid it is bonds. If I understand it this money is to be raised and applied within ten years. Will not these roads be practically worn out before the end of the thirty-five years, and will we not be giving our children and grandchildren a system of worn-out roads for which they will have to help pay and for the upkeep of which they will be heavily taxed?

I have been making a few figures here and I imagine our children and grandchildren will have enough burdens of their own without us laying any more burdens on them. Figuring these roads as costing \$6,000 per mile, if

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

we spend the \$50,000,000 we would have about 8300 miles of road.

Now, this state is about 200 miles square. A road across the state in each direction would be 400 miles. Divide 400 in 8300, and you have a little over twenty. So you would have roads across the state about ten miles apart each way. I doubt if the people of the country would be satisfied to pay taxes on roads about ten miles apart each way. I have figured it out and it would take about \$500,000,000 to build roads one mile apart over this state, and I don't think we would be satisfied with anything less than that. In some places we ought to have roads every half mile.

Five million dollars per year, as is proposed by the gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. LAMPSON], would be about eight-tenths of a mill on an estimate of \$6,000,000,000. It is a question with me why the state of Ohio could not raise this tax in cash every year, and then we would have no interest to pay and we wouldn't have a large debt to pay off at the end of thirty-five years; then we would not frighten the farmers and taxpayers of Ohio. I remember thirty years ago that we as farmers were glad to haul out our road taxes of three mills on mud roads, and we didn't grumble.

Mr. LAMPSON: Does not the gentleman think the present system of mud roads is a heavier tax than the proposed bonded issue?

Mr. DUNN: That may be, but they don't see it. Napoleon a hundred years ago laid out the foundation of France's financial system, and it was understood that there was to be no debt, that all expenses were to be paid each year. That was the main principle in the very foundation of France's financial system one hundred years ago. France has fine roads built by this cash system.

Mr. FOX: As far as Mercer county is concerned, from what I have ascertained, we are all willing to have good roads. We are not as familiar with the matter as we should be, but we are trying to get information as we go along. The gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. PECK] said that the rural counties should be quiet on this and on that. Mercer county is on the map just the same, and we want to have our say. The small as well as the large want to be heard. Of course, I understand the Judge meant it all right. I am satisfied whatever we do in the way of getting this through the legislature in the right way will be all right. We know full well the legislature does not always do as the rural people think they should do. Some of us thought we were going to receive quite a lot of money from the automobiles. They did pay quite a sum of money in the last four or five years, and in our part of the state we have been wondering who is getting the money. We don't know who got it. We all know where this money is going to but we don't know how it is going to be divided, and we don't want it to go the same way that the automobile money has gone. We are not afraid of a bond issue at all. Many a farmer when he pays off the debt on his farm buys another and goes in debt for it, and in a few years he has that paid off. We are not afraid of debt when it is created for a legitimate purpose.

I like the suggestion made that we should go rather slow on this matter, and hear from home—hear what our friends think about it, and then take up the matter in two

weeks. I think at the end of that time we can talk more intelligently about it than we can now.

Our people asked me about a week ago when this would come up and what I thought about it, and I told them I thought the fairest way would be to divide the money equally among the counties according to the square miles. I am satisfied a plan of that sort would be satisfactory to the people in the western part of the state.

Mr. HALFHILL: Just at the risk of being a little bit tedious I would like to go back to the foundation of the matter here. In section 1 of article VIII I find a statement as to what public debts may be incurred, and for what purpose, and the debts are limited to \$750,000. Now, we would think ordinarily that that was a pretty precise instruction to the legislature, but we turn over to article XII and look at section 6, and we find this put in, evidently to nail down beyond any question the original purpose of the restriction in section 1, article VIII: "The state shall never contract any debt for purposes of internal improvement." Now, why that provision of the constitution at that time? Why did that convention of 1851, after putting in the restriction as to the amount of debts we could contract, nail it down with this clause that we are trying to amend? And in looking at that we can discover something of the financial situation of the state of Ohio at that time.

The purpose of putting in that section 6, it is supposed, was to prevent the building of any more canals or reservoirs, and to prevent the state from entering into railroad building. At that time there were less than 100 miles of railroad, and this was put in so that the state of Ohio could not launch into the building of railroads as an internal improvement and could not further extend the canal system. We were at that time \$18,000,000 in debt, and the grand tax duplicate of Ohio was \$508,851,907. That was the value of all taxable property in the state of Ohio at that time, and it would not have been that much if the early settlers of Ohio had not by internal improvement made it possible to settle up some of the land. And that gradually led to something else.

Now we are a great deal larger. We have increased that tax duplicate so that it is now over \$6,000,000,000, we have no bonded debt and we raise from our ordinary sources of revenue each year off this duplicate \$13,000,000 in round numbers. If we want to enter upon an era of improvement for the purpose of building good roads, and are as progressive as the men in 1852, we could now on the same basis issue bonds to \$600,000,000, and pay them just as easily as the people of the state of Ohio could pay the \$13,000,000 then.

There are men in this Convention who helped to discharge that obligation of \$18,000,000 in paying their taxes. So much for that.

Now, what about the theory they had in mind? To use round figures, and I think I am a little more accurate in fixing the mileage of the state of Ohio than some of the others have been, there are 88,000 miles of public roadways in the state of Ohio, and if you follow up the system of inter-county highways, such as has been suggested, so that each county in the state is linked up with the next county, and each city is linked to the next city, you will have built roads to about one-tenth of the mileage of all the roads now in the state of Ohio. That leaves nine-

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

tenths of the roads of Ohio to be improved and built by the counties, if they want to get out of the mud, and the counties must build this nine-tenths in order that their byroads shall lead into the trunk lines and become available as means of transportation. If any county in the state is desirous of staying in the mud it does not have to build them, but the trunk line will be built, and I don't think that any counties would have more than 100 miles of that trunk line.

Now what about the expense of building the roads that the county will have to build? We have expended \$3,000,000 in the building of roads in our county, and we have no bonds out that were given for roads. I take it that under an equitable apportionment or division of this fund, that hundred miles of highway in our county, which will form a big part of the inter-county system of roads, will be a credit to us—that we will be given credit for that, because we are able to turn over as good a road as the state highway commission will build. But suppose we turned over a road worth fifty cents on the dollar, compared with the specifications of the state highway commission, we would still get credit on that for fifty cents on the dollar on the hundred miles of road, which we will not thereafter have to keep up. It will be kept up and repaired by the state as part of our internal improvements, and if the state pays us back for that one hundred miles we turn over we can take that fund and improve our other highways. Now I think that is the logical way that that thing can be worked out, and I do hope we will not put into this provision here details that will raise controversies. I applaud the sentiment of the gentleman from Hamilton [Mr. PECK], that we are a state. We are a great state; we are an empire within an empire. We have more people in Ohio than England had at the time of Queen Elizabeth.

Now it is idle to talk about waiting for the federal government to commence a system of highways. When a boy I was out in Colorado, and I remember of attending a meeting in Denver when they were talking about an irrigating ditch. They had sent a delegation to the interior department in Washington, seeking federal aid to build an irrigating ditch. There wasn't anything done. Finally there was some generally progressive man who said "Let's get out and dig and build the ditch ourselves." They did it with private capital. They started an irrigating program in the state of Colorado and it proved so successful that it formed the basis of the great legislation which was afterwards undertaken by congress and which will finally redeem all the arid lands of the West.

Now we should start and be ready to accept any aid that may come from the federal government, and if we start it might be the means of getting the federal government going sooner than it otherwise would.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the gentleman pardon me? Debate must close in one minute.

Mr. DWYER: I move that we extend the debate until five o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: That motion is out of order. The house itself closed debate at four o'clock.

Mr. DWYER: I appeal from the ruling of the chair. I have a right to make that motion, and if the chair decides it out of order I will appeal.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is not in order for

two reasons. In the first place, the gentleman from Allen [Mr. HALFHILL], had the floor and did not yield it—

Mr. DWYER: Will the gentleman from Allen [Mr. HALFHILL] yield to me to move to extend time for debate until five o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN: If the gentleman from Allen yields the motion can then be made, and the chair will then decide whether it is in order. The chair will recognize the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. MARRIOTT: I now move that the committee rise and report progress.

The motion was seconded and was carried, and Vice President Fess resumed the chair.

In Convention.

Mr. KNIGHT: The committee of the Whole, having had under consideration Proposal No. 118—Mr. Lampson, has decided to rise and report that it has come to no resolution thereon.

A DELEGATE: I move that the report be received.

Mr. DWYER: I move that the matter be made a special order for two weeks from now.

Mr. DOTY: I move that the further consideration of Proposal No. 118 be postponed until tomorrow, and be placed at the head of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The first motion in order, and the only motion, is to receive the report of the committee of the Whole.

Mr. DOTY: I withdraw my motion until the report of the committee of the Whole is disposed of.

The motion to accept the report of the committee of the Whole was seconded, and being put to a vote was carried.

Mr. DOTY: I now move that the further consideration of Proposal No. 118 be postponed until tomorrow morning, and that it be placed at the head of the calendar.

Mr. LAMPSON: I second the motion.

Mr. HALFHILL: I have a resolution that I would like to have read.

Mr. LAMPSON: Let us dispose of this motion first.

The VICE PRESIDENT: We want to be parliamentary, and the motion before the house will have to be put unless you have some privileged question.

Mr. HALFHILL: I thought the chair had recognized me. I don't want to stand in the way of the other motion at all.

Mr. DWYER: I move to amend the motion by making this matter a special order for two weeks from today at one o'clock.

Mr. HALFHILL: I want to offer a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent at this time.

Mr. DOTY: I don't think the gentleman understands that there is a motion pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT: There is a question pending and an amendment to it by Judge Dwyer.

Mr. LAMPSON: I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Montgomery [Mr. DWYER] will not prevail. We can go on with the debate, and then postpone it until some other time if we desire to do so. I do not expect to force this matter to a vote until the Convention is ready.

Mr. DWYER: I will withdraw my motion if it is

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads.

desired to discuss the question tomorrow with the view of laying it over after that time.

Mr. PRICE: Then I make that same motion to extend two weeks.

Mr. LAMPSON: Two weeks from when?

Mr. DWYER: Two weeks from today was my motion, but if the Convention is to discuss the matter further now, I will withdraw my motion, and then we can fix the time when the discussion closes.

Mr. PRICE: Is the discussion on my motion to amend?

The VICE PRESIDENT: No; the motion of Judge Dwyer was the same as yours.

Mr. PRICE: I understood that he withdrew it.

The VICE PRESIDENT: No; his second did not consent, and therefore his motion still stands.

Mr. PRICE: Then it is on Judge Dwyer's motion? I think I agree with the sentiment expressed here in favor of good roads, but I do say that this little item of expending \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000 does not seem so small to me that I would not like to think over it a little time. If this good roads question goes through and we embark upon the expenditure of this much money, imposing that much indebtedness on the state for that number of years, it would excite serious consideration. There have been a number of questions raised that suggest other questions, and I think before we finally dispose of this matter we should know something of the sentiments of the people upon this question, and we ought particularly to know how it is going to work out when it is turned over to the general assembly for equitable distribution. We are afraid that all the equity will not get to its proper destination.

One question I think ought to be considered is the method of distribution. There are several other important questions that should be carefully considered, and therefore I favor putting this matter over, not for the purpose of defeating it or creating opposition to it, but to familiarize ourselves with it, so that we may more intelligently dispose of it.

This proposal comes to us for the first time this morning in its present form. I for one have not been able to examine it carefully. It was amended by the committee by additions made to it, and I want time to examine its context carefully so that I can intelligently dispose of it. I don't think postponement will defeat it, but will really tend to a satisfactory solution of it.

Mr. MILLER, of Fairfield: I am not satisfied in my own mind that I am going to vote for that, because we may not need roads in the future; we may be flying through the air.

Mr. DUNN: There are a good many here who have not expressed their minds on this question, and it seems to me that we should debate it at length, and to the very last, so that we can have all the facts to lay before our people at home. After tomorrow's debate, if we lay the matter over two weeks, we can hear from our people at home.

Mr. DOTY: I would like to call the attention of the Convention to the situation we will be in tomorrow if the motion of the gentleman from Montgomery [Mr. DWYER], prevails. We will have a calendar which consists of Proposal No. 13 by Mr. Riley. That will be our sole business tomorrow. How are we better to get

at our own opinion and the opinions of each other than by staying here and discussing questions of the importance of spending \$50,000,000? That is an important question, and how better can we get the matter thoroughly sifted than by exchanging ideas here publicly? That is what we are here for. There are two ways to arrive at conclusions. One is in the secrecy of your office or home, and the other is by free open discussion. I have learned a lot about good roads in this discussion, and some things about my own county I didn't know before. Perhaps I was the only one in a condition to learn anything from the debate, but I have learned quite a bit, and if we waste tomorrow and do nothing, and that's just what will happen if we put this matter over, some of you will hear from your home counties; the people will want to know why you are not doing something besides adjourning from Thursday to Monday.

Mr. HARRIS, of Ashtabula: I am quite in sympathy with the remarks of the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY], for a wonder.

Mr. DOTY: It is a wonder, I admit.

Mr. HARRIS, of Ashtabula: The trouble is that although the committee on Rules has resolved on doing business on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, it has transpired that on the morning of Thursday the members pack their grips and expect to scamper by ten o'clock.

Mr. DOTY: No; eleven-thirty.

Mr. HARRIS, of Ashtabula: If we are going to limit our sessions to three days a week we ought to have three days. The proposition of the gentleman from Washington will take but little time, and I don't see why we can not discuss this question tomorrow. And I am in sympathy with the gentleman from Cuyahoga in another thing. If we want information on this subject, where are we going to get it? If we go up one road and down another, what answer do we get? What do the people know as to what is going on on this floor? The chairman of the committee says he does not want to curtail the debate, and he will not press the matter to a vote. Let us go on and discuss it, and then if we want to lay it over to hear from the people, lay it over.

Mr. PIERCE: I would suggest to the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. DOTY], and the gentleman from Ashtabula [Mr. HARRIS] that by the time we read the journal and approve it, which begins at half-past ten, and then listen to the speech from Governor Harmon at eleven o'clock, these very gentlemen will want to adjourn the Convention until next week, and the Convention after all will not do anything on this good roads question. I would like to see it go over for two weeks so that the people can be heard from.

The VICE PRESIDENT: Let me make an announcement handed me just now on the matter suggested by the member from Butler [Mr. PIERCE]: "Please announce before adjournment that the governor will speak tomorrow at eleven-thirty."

Mr. ROEHM: For four weeks I have been trying to get some kind of a proposal in here, and two or three days ago I finally figured out something I wanted to bring before the Convention, and they deferred it. I don't seem to have been able to get down to that part of the business. Now I am in favor of Friday sessions. I think we ought to settle that this week. It ought to

Extending State Bond Limit for Inter-County Wagon Roads, Etc.

be settled tomorrow. I would not be opposed to postponement of this proposition for two weeks if tomorrow we could go on to some regular work, have it settled about Friday sessions, and then after that debate until twelve o'clock tomorrow night even on this matter. I'll stay here that long if you want me to.

Mr. DOTY: There are no proposals on the calendar.

Mr. ROEHM: They are in the hands of committees.

Mr. DOTY: They won't be in tomorrow.

Mr. ROEHM: I am one of the youngsters who has not had any experience in parliamentary matters like the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. Dory]. I am sure he would have had his proposal before the Convention long ago by some means or other, and I would like to see some of us who don't know all these little tricks given an opportunity to get our proposals out. If you will just tell us some method of getting our proposals out of the committee and before the Convention, I have no objection to this matter being debated for the next two weeks.

Mr. KNIGHT: I hope the amendment will not carry. I think all the information that we can carry home to our people at this time is that we don't know much about this matter. We should certainly discuss it until we have something that we can tell our citizens. My chief function today was to listen. I have heard a good many things. I have heard some good things about Franklin county that are not so, and I think we should continue this discussion as our regular work. We have assurance after assurance that there is no intent on the part of the committee to close debate and force a vote, and it does seem to me that there should be further discussion on it. Now that we have gotten the brakes off and gotten to work, we ought not put the brakes on again; it may take us two weeks to get them off again.

I hope the pending amendment will be defeated, and the original motion to put on the calendar carried.

Mr. WINN: I rise to say that there is little doubt that we will have something to do tomorrow forenoon whether this pending question goes over until then or not. All that is necessary for us to satisfy ourselves on that score is to go back to the proceedings of this morning, when we devoted an hour and a half to the question of inserting the words in the journal "thereupon the president resumed his chair". I beg of you just to think what would have been the result had not these parliamentarians come to the rescue and seen to it that those words were inserted in the journal. Had the record of our proceedings gone thundering down the ages for the benefit of posterity without those all vital words inserted, what would have become of us? I mention this only to emphasize the fact that whether we postpone this question until tomorrow or otherwise, we are sure to have something to do.

Mr. EVANS: I think we are all laboring under a mistake. I think the question that is presented in this house now is the most important question that has been presented in the state of Ohio for sixty-one years, since the present constitution took effect. That constitution forbade the state to go into debt over \$750,000, and it further forbade the state to go into debt for any internal improvement. We have lived under that policy for sixty-one years. The question today before this body is not so much whether we shall have good roads,

but whether we shall take away those limitations of our present constitution, and whether we shall open the doors to go into debt, not only for good roads, but for a new state house and for other things that the state may require. In view of that, the result of this debate may change the whole policy of the state of Ohio. I don't think we should put it off for two weeks. I think we should keep at it until we can thresh it out, but I want to say here that I am utterly opposed to Friday sessions.

Mr. DOTY: Tomorrow will be Thursday.

Mr. EVANS: Let us keep at it. For my part I am in favor of wiping out the restrictions in the constitution; I am in favor of letting the doors open and permitting the state to go into debt for good roads and other things that we want. I believe we can trust the people of the state of Ohio. I am opposed to making this Constitutional Convention the guardians of the state. I hope the motion to postpone as long as two weeks will not prevail.

Mr. THOMAS: I move to further amend that the consideration of the proposal be postponed until tomorrow at two o'clock.

The motion was lost.

A vote being taken on the motion to postpone two weeks, the motion was lost.

A vote being taken on the motion that it retain its place in regular order on the calendar, the motion was carried.

Mr. HALFHILL: I ask unanimous consent to introduce a resolution.

Mr. CASSIDY: Before that is done, I have a resolution here from the Claims committee, and I ask that the rules be suspended and this matter be disposed of immediately. It is merely routine business.

Mr. DOTY: I move that the rules be suspended.

The motion was carried.

The VICE PRESIDENT: We'll hear the resolution.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolution No. 65:

Resolved, That the following list of bills which have been filed with the secretary of this Convention be allowed and ordered paid:

Central Union Telephone Co., rentals ...	\$40.30
Central Union Telephone Co., toll	49.75
Hiss Stamp Works, supplies	14.30
Joseph Justice, service	75.00
J. E. Kersting, express85
Merwine & Moore, service	20.85
McClelland & Co., supplies	2.25
H. W. Krumm, postage	30.00
Remington Typewriter Co., rentals	9.00
A. Rosnagle, supplies	14.00
E. H. Sell & Co., supplies and rental ...	93.65
Smith Premier Typewriter Co., rental ..	7.00
A. H. Smythe, supplies	79.59
Underwood Typewriter Co., rental	22.25
H. R. Young, supplies	11.55

Mr. CASSIDY: I move that the rules be suspended, and the resolution referred to the committee on Claims at once.

The motion was carried.

Resolution Relative to Caucus Agreements—Petitions and Memorials.

Mr. HALFHILL: Now I ask unanimous consent to introduce a resolution.

The consent was given, and the resolution was read as follows:

Resolution No. 66:

WHEREAS, It is commonly reported that an effort is being made to get a portion of or a majority of the members of this Convention to go into a caucus or conference for the purpose of agreement upon certain matters now pending before the Convention and to abide by the result of such conference or caucus in their proceedings in the body on such matters.

WHEREAS, It is reported that efforts are being made to get members of this Convention to sign a pledge or written statement, whereby such signers agree to go into a caucus and to be bound by a majority vote of such caucus as to their future action and votes in this body on the matters to be considered by such caucus.

WHEREAS, It is reported that some members of this Convention have already signed such a written statement and efforts are being made to get a majority of the members of this body to sign such a written statement; therefore,

Be it resolved, That it is the sense of this Convention that all matters pending in this body should be settled in the committees of this body or in open Convention, and that members of the body ought not to sign written statements agreeing to go into any conference or caucus and be bound in the Convention by the action of such caucus.

Mr. HALFHILL: I now move the suspension of the rules and that this be placed on its passage, and I want to say right here that the resolution is one of personal privilege. I think that I as a member of this Convention have a perfect right to hear arguments before any committee to aid me in voting on that committee's report.

Mr. MAUCK: The resolution goes over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The motion is to suspend the rules.

Mr. HALFHILL: I was speaking on the motion to suspend.

The VICE PRESIDENT: A motion to suspend the rules is not debatable.

Mr. HALFHILL: I was speaking on a matter of privilege on the introduction of this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The chair so considered it, and did not call the gentleman out of order.

Mr. FARRELL: If there is a motion to suspend the rules, it is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The motion will go without debate.

A viva voce vote was taken, and the vice president was unable to decide and called for a division.

On the division the vote stood 53 yeas and 51 nays.

Mr. DOTY: I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. LAMPSON: I second the call for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT: I would have to declare the motion lost.

Mr. DOTY: I beg pardon; I withdraw the demand for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT: The vote is 53 to 51, and as it requires a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules the motion is lost.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. Nye presented the petitions of the Political Study Club; of Clara Snell Wolfe and many other citizens of Lorain county, asking for the constitution to include full franchise for women; which were referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Stilwell presented the petition of Cataract Lodge No. 24 of A. A. of I. S. & T. W. of Cuyahoga county, for semi-monthly or weekly pay day without holdback; which was referred to the committee on Labor.

Mr. Stilwell presented the petition of J. V. Fogle-song of Cleveland, relative to double taxation; which was referred to the committee on Taxation.

Mr. Redington presented the petitions of John Hulp; of William Sim; of Frank Justin; of E. C. Miller and three hundred thirty-five other citizens of Lorain county, asking for the license law; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Redington presented the petition of E. H. Thompson and many other citizens of Lorain county, asking for the restriction of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Riley presented the petition of J. F. Hamilton and three hundred seventy-nine other citizens of Washington county, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Stamm presented the petition of Edward Gerber and fifty-nine other citizens of Sandusky county, asking for favorable action on Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Tetlow presented the petition of W. W. Dow and one hundred twenty-five other citizens of Columbiana county, recommending passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Thomas presented the petition of Wm. Koepcke and one hundred ninety-eight other citizens of Cuyahoga county, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Peters presented the remonstrances of the Glenwood M. E. Sunday school; of the St. Clair U. B. Sunday school; of the Avondale U. B. Sunday school; of West Second Avenue Presbyterian Sabbath school; of Indianola M. E. Sunday school; of the First Christian church; of the Third Street M. E. church; of the Reeb Ave. M. E. church; of the Monroe Ave. Lutheran church; of the Highland Friends Sunday school; of the North Minster Presbyterian Sunday school; of the Welsh Presbyterian church; of the Indianola Methodist Episcopal church, of Columbus; protesting against a license clause in the constitution; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Peters presented the petition of the M. E. church of Shepard; of the M. E. church, of Reynoldsburg; of Thos. H. Kohr and other citizens of Linden Heights; of the M. E. Sunday school, of West Park; of the

Petitions and Memorials.

Franklin Farmers' Institute, of Groveport; of the United Brethren Sunday school, of Canal Winchester; of the M. E. Sunday School, of Hilliard; of a Sunday school, of Georgesville; of the M. E. Sunday school, of Brice; of Central College Sunday school, of Westerville; of the M. E. Sunday school, of Canal Winchester; opposed to the insertion of any license clause in the constitution; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Peters presented the petition of the College Equal Suffrage League, of Columbus, asking for woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Peters presented the petition of Mary Boyd Yeoman and many other citizens of Hillsboro, asking for woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. DeFrees presented the petition of W. J. Ramsey and fifty-eight other citizens of Miami county, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. DeFrees presented the petition of J. W. Kilbourn and several hundred other citizens of Miami county, protesting against the licensing of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Elson presented the petition of James Smith and two hundred six other citizens of Athens county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Marshall presented the petition of Edward Pegg and one hundred four other citizens of Coshocton county, in favor of Proposal No. 4 without amendment; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Watson presented the petition of Margaret Wilson and other citizens of Hillsboro relative to woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Watson presented the petitions of O. W. Turnbaugh and the Rev. H. S. Chase, of Guernsey county, relative to the liquor traffic; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of College Equal Suffrage League, of Columbus, asking for equal suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petitions of D. E. Russell and seventy-four other citizens of Athens county; E. S. Woolweaver of Wellsville; of J. E. Curtis and forty-four other citizens of Belmont county; of Cornelius Murphy and other citizens of Clermont county; of Frank C. Kelley and thirty-one other citizens of Clark county; of C. A. Geise and twenty-five other citizens of Champaign county; of Joseph Dominick and one hundred twenty-seven other citizens of Cuyahoga county; of F. Neighbor of Coshocton; of Fred Lanton and twenty-four other citizens of Defiance county; of Joe Mayer and other citizens of Delaware county; of P. C. Brewer and ninety-three other citizens of Darke county; of E. S. Taylor and thirty-eight other citizens of Erie county; of Martin Tracey and other citizens of Highland county; of H. F. Ambrose and sixty-five other citizens of Hocking county; of Wm. Doepke and forty-eight other citizens of Jefferson county; of F. J. Loop and forty-eight other citizens of Knox county; of Harry K. Thomas and thir-

ty-five other citizens of Lawrence county; of C. E. Lawrence and sixteen other citizens of Lorain county; of J. McKee of Lake View; of Otto Gooding of Newark; of Harry Carr and one hundred twenty-four citizens of Lucas county; of F. W. Timm and thirty-one other citizens of Mahoning county; of C. E. Templeton and fifty-eight other citizens of Monroe county; of A. C. Lamb and other citizens of Marion county; of Chris Bentz and eleven other citizens of Meigs county; of Wm. Paine and other citizens of Madison county; of Jas. Haney and fifty-five other citizens of Miami county; of John Eben and twenty-two other citizens of Montgomery county; of Jerry Green of Logan; of Harry D. Wolf and thirteen other citizens of Pickaway county; of C. L. Brown and twenty other citizens of Portage county; of W. E. Bender and one hundred forty-one other citizens of Preble county; of L. L. Lambert and forty-three other citizens of Ross county; of J. F. Snyder and one hundred twenty-six other citizens of Sandusky county; of B. E. Hurton of Houston; of Frank Purcell and forty-one other citizens of Stark county; of George N. Smith and forty-one other citizens of Summit county; of Gust L. Anderson and other citizens of Trumbull county; of John H. Heck and other citizens of Union county; of L. A. Ward and other citizens of Wood county; of Frank Beck and seventy-nine other citizens of Washington county; of Thomas Donnelly and nineteen other citizens of Cuyahoga county; of F. W. Reifsnider and one hundred four other citizens of Champaign county; of S. Murray and twenty other citizens of Wellsville; of W. J. Thorn and twenty other citizens of Tiffin; of A. J. Snavely and twenty-three other citizens of Tuscarawas county; asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Hahn presented the petition of Herbert Matheny and sixty-eight other citizens of Cuyahoga county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Ludey presented the petition of Aaron Goldstein and eight other citizens of Monroe county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Pettit presented the petitions of H. E. Demming and other citizens of Manchester; of H. E. Roebuck and other citizens of Adams county; of the First Presbyterian church of West Union; of J. O. McManis, of West Union, against licensing the liquor traffic; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petitions of the Evangelical Bible school, of Lindsey; of the First Presbyterian church, of Belle Center; of M. A. Gebert, of Huron; of J. E. Workler of Oberlin; of the First Presbyterian church, of Ostrander; of J. W. Blessing, of Risingsun; of T. C. Blessing, of Risingsun; of the Muskingum county Good Government Committee; of the Methodist Episcopal church, of Perry; of Geo. H. Young, of Springfield; of C. W. Reed, of Uhrichsville; of Orval E. Stair, of Oberlin; of the Oberlin Theological Seminary, of Oberlin; of the First Congregational church, of Cleveland; of the Indianola M. E. church, of Columbus; of M. L. Musser, of Oberlin; of V. I. Archer, of Lewisburg; of the Ministerial Association of Coshocton; of the First Presbyterian church, of West Union;

Petitions and Memorials.

of Maude J. Wade, of Columbus; of the United Brethren church, of Elida; of the Indianola M. E. Sunday school, of Columbus; of the Christian Endeavor society of the Grace United Brethren church, of Columbus; of the United Brethren church of the McComb circuit; of the Presbyterian church, of Petersburg; of the Washington Street Congregational church, of Toledo; of the Methodist Episcopal church, of Lisbon; of A. R. Johnson, of Columbus; of the associated churches of East Palestine; of the Grace Methodist Episcopal church, of Akron; of the North Minster Presbyterian Sunday school, of Columbus; of Williamsburg Methodist Episcopal church, of Williamsburg; of the Williamsburg township Sunday school convention in Williamsburg; of the Highland Friends Sunday school, of Columbus; of the First Lutheran congregation of Bellefontaine; asking the Convention to refrain from incorporating any license clause in the constitution; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Stilwell presented the petition of Steven Somosy and thirty-five other citizens of Cuyahoga county, asking for the licensing of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Stilwell presented the petition of the M. E. church of East Cleveland against unrestricted license; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Redington presented the petition of H. A. Snider and many other citizens of Lorain against license law; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Redington presented the petition of Martin Mueller and fifty others against license law; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Weybrecht presented the petition of the Rev. Geo. E. Jackson and eighteen other pastors of churches of Canton protesting against unrestricted license clause in the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petition of Samuel Weinfeld and two hundred seventy other citizens of Lima supporting Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Fess presented the petitions of F. W. Stanton and two hundred forty-eight other citizens of Hancock county protesting against a license clause in the constitution; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. DeFrees presented the petitions of M. E. Flesh and Joe G. Schnell and of Henry Blacke and two hundred sixteen other citizens of Miami county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4 without amendment; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. DeFrees presented the resolution of W. A. Zimmerman and other citizens of Miami county against the licensing of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Henderson presented the resolution of the Ministerial Association of Belle Center and other citizens of Logan county requesting that no license clause be inserted in the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Hahn presented the petition of the Commercial Protective Association and six hundred forty-eight oth-

er citizens of Cuyahoga county favoring the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Kilpatrick presented the resolution of the First Baptist church, of Hubbard, against licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Longstreth presented the petitions of J. W. Jenkins; of Jas. H. Langley; of F. Hildebrandt and many other citizens of Hocking county, asking this Convention to adopt Proposal No. 4; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Lambert presented the petitions of the W. C. T. U. of Jackson county and many others, asking the Convention to adopt woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Malin presented the petition of B. C. Brown and fifty-nine other citizens of Lake county asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Matthews presented the remonstrance of the Sharon Methodist Episcopal church, of Putnam county, against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Nye presented the petition of the First church, of Oberlin, protesting against the incorporation of a license clause in the new constitution; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Beyer presented the petitions of the U. B. church of Rawson; of the Young Men's Christian Association and other citizens of Findlay; of W. E. Snyder and many other citizens of Hancock county; of the Rev. Turner and other citizens of Arlington; regarding liquor traffic; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Cassidy presented the petitions of W. P. Lutz; of Ed Ackels; of N. J. Poor; of B. A. Deardorff; of Harve W. Foulk; of Lincoln H. Lamb; of L. D. Horner; of E. Bert Dillon; of J. A. Conter; of Lewis Scott; of F. L. Watkins; of Roy Cockerell; of J. B. Poor; of J. G. Stamats; of James Richey; of Thos. Kyle and three hundred thirteen other citizens of Logan county; asking that Proposal No. 4 introduced by Mr. King, be adopted without amendment; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Doty presented the petition of Fred Portlage and nine hundred sixty-nine other citizens of Cuyahoga county, requesting the Convention to adopt Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King, without amendment; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Davio presented the petition of M. L. McDermott and two hundred other citizens of Cuyahoga county, in favor of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. FitzSimons presented the petition of Edward Schneider and eight hundred ninety-one other citizens of Cuyahoga county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Fackler presented the petition of J. A. Renck and one hundred ninety-nine other citizens of Cuyahoga

Petitions and Memorials.

county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Smith, of Geauga, presented the petition of E. C. Ralph and forty-nine other citizens of Geauga county, favoring the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bowdle presented the petitions of James Anderson and one thousand two hundred nine other citizens of Hamilton county; of William Bossong and two hundred other citizens of Lucas county; of Carl Miller and nine hundred other citizens of Cuyahoga county; of Peter Ballinger and one hundred eighty other citizens of Clermont county; asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4, licensing the liquor traffic; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bowdle presented the petitions of J. M. Ebrite and other citizens of Logan county; of A. LeSourd of Bellefontaine; of Dr. Burnett of Bellefontaine; of the Bethel M. E. church of Bethel; of the Methodist Ministers of Cincinnati; of Montgomery County Ministerial Association; Ohio Woman's Christian Temperance Union; of J. F. Olive of Bellefontaine; of H. G. Ashburn of Cincinnati; the M. E. church of Catawba; of the W. C. T. U. of Carthage; the Farmers' Institute of Pleasant township, relative to the liquor traffic; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Ulmer presented the petition of Chas. Molter and sixty-seven other citizens of Lucas county, favoring the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Partington presented the petition of John J. Reed and eleven other citizens of Shelby county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Harbarger presented the resolutions of Indianola M. E. Sunday school, of Franklin county; of the North Minster Presbyterian Sunday school, of Columbus; of the Glenwood M. E. Sunday school, of Columbus; the M. E. church and five hundred other citizens of Reynoldsburg; the Sunday school of Georgesville; the West Second Avenue Presbyterian church, of Columbus; the M. E. Sunday school, of Alton; relative to the liquor traffic; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Fluke presented the petition of The Ashland Ministerial Association of Ashland county, protesting against the licensing of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Wise presented the petition of the pastors of the churches of Canton and twelve thousand other citizens of Stark county, protesting against unrestricted license, and asking the Convention to grant the temperance forces a larger opportunity to further restrict and prohibit the saloons; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Wise presented the petition of J. Y. Williams and one hundred thirty-four other citizens of Stark county, against unrestricted license; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Wise presented the petition of Margaret Wilson and other citizens of Hillsboro, asking for woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Weybrecht presented the memorial of John Y.

Williams and one hundred thirty-five other citizens of Alliance, disapproving of the liquor program for mandatory and unrestricted license—and recommending the submission of some alternative proposition prohibiting the traffic in intoxicating liquors throughout the state outside of cities of 100,000 population or more—and urging that no proposition be submitted until the people have had time to be informed as to its meaning and effect; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Davio presented the petition of Geo. J. Becks and sixty-six other citizens of Cleveland, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Davio presented memorial of the Windemere Methodist Episcopal church, of East Cleveland, protesting against the licensing of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Davio presented the petition of Mary Boyd Yeoman and other citizens of Hillsboro in favor of woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Thomas presented the memorials of the Men's Club of the Epworth Memorial M. E. church of Cleveland; of the Windemere M. E. church of East Cleveland; of the First Congregational church of Cleveland, against the licensing of the liquor traffic; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Thomas presented the petition of one hundred citizens of Cuyahoga county in favor of Proposal No. 4, licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petitions of the Ashland Ministers' Association; of J. E. Barnard of Oberlin; of Robert W. Chalfant, of Bellefontaine; of the Rev. W. I. Hagerman and other citizens of Toledo; of the Westminster Presbyterian church representing a congregation of over seven hundred; of the Westminster Presbyterian Sunday school, representing a membership of one hundred seventy-nine, of Wooster, relative to the traffic in intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petitions of R. M. Ramsay and seventy-nine other citizens of Wood county; of H. Horning of Kent; of Granville Knox, of Knox county; of Leonard Mohr, of Columbus; of R. S. Davis and thirty other citizens of Ross county; of Edward Day and one hundred four other citizens of Wyandot county; of Carl A. Fissel and thirty other citizens of Defiance county; of George V. Clark and thirty-two other citizens of Guernsey county; of C. V. Woodruff and other citizens of Hocking; of G. E. Schmidt and other citizens of Lawrence county; of Jas. R. Carter and other citizens of Jefferson county; of A. W. Kraft and other citizens of Lake county; of A. E. Burnham and twenty other citizens of Lorain county; of Max Green and twenty-one other citizens of Madison county; of Sam J. Williams and twenty-one other citizens of Montgomery county; of R. Wilson and one hundred nineteen other citizens of Lucas county; of Thos. Young and twenty-two other citizens of Coshocton county; of T. H. Williamson and ninety-three other citizens of Cuyahoga county; of Elmer Harris and ten other citizens of Seneca county; of Walter Ess and sixty-four other citi-

Petitions and Memorials.

zens of Stark county; of M. N. Sprinkle and forty-six other citizens of Summit county; of Christ Bentz and thirty-seven other citizens of Tuscarawas county; of Charles Smith and forty-four other citizens of Union county; of Fred L. Walker and twenty-nine other citizens of Miami county; of Walter G. Smith and twenty-six other citizens of Washington county; of Chas. Holdcrafft and twenty-two other citizens of Athens county;

of R. H. Wagner and twenty-eight other citizens of Champaign county; of Monroe Jackson and thirty other citizens of Clark county; of Henry T. Logan and eighty-nine other citizens of Columbiana county, asking for the passage of Proposal No. 4; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

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