

FOURTEENTH DAY

EVENING SESSION.

MONDAY, February 5, 1912.

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment, was called to order by the president pro tem and opened with prayer by the member from Holmes [Mr. WALKER].

The journal of Thursday, February 1, was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrances of the First United Brethren church, of Lima; the Market Street Presbyterian church, of Lima; the M. E. church, of Delphos, Allen county; the Salem M. E. Sabbath school, of Harrod, Allen county; the Trinity Lutheran church, of Ashland; the Emanuel Evangelical church, of Ashland; the Prospect Street Presbyterian church, of Ashtabula; the Regular Baptist church, of Waynesfield, Auglaize county; the Barnesville Christian church, of Barnesville; the Crowse Memorial Lutheran church, of Tiro, Crawford county; the Dunham Christian Sunday school, of Cleveland; the Wade Park Ave. Methodist Episcopal church, of Cleveland; the New Stone U. B. church, of Cleveland; the Madison Ave. Baptist church, of Cleveland; the St. Clair St. M. E. church, of Cleveland; the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Ayersville, Defiance county; the St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal church, of Delaware; the Methodist Episcopal church, of Ashley, Delaware county; the Methodist Episcopal church, of Delta, Fulton county; the M. E. church of Fayette; the Christian church and Sunday school, of Chardon, Geauga county; the Central Church of Christ, of Findlay; the First U. B. church, of Van Buren; the Methodist Protestant church, of Arlington, Hancock county; the U. B. church, of Rawson, Hancock county; the United Brethren church, of Dunkirk, Hardin county; the United Brethren church, of Walnut Grove, Hardin county; the M. E. church and Sunday school, of McClure, Henry county; the Presbyterian church, of DeGraff, Logan county; the Belle Center Methodist Episcopal church, of Belle Center, Logan county; the M. E. church, of West Liberty, Logan county; the United Presbyterian church, of Bellefontaine; the Methodist Episcopal church, of Elyria; the Emanuel Evangelical church, of Lorain; the Baptist churches of the Trumbull Association, Mahoning county; the Youngstown Ministerial Association, of Youngstown; the Belmont Ave. M. E. church, of Youngstown; the Poland Presbyterian church, of Poland; the Methodist church of Mallet Creek, of Medina county; the Congregational church, of York, Medina county; the Congregational church, of Ft. Recovery, Mercer county; the First Presbyterian church, of Cardington; the M. E. church, of Cardington; the Trinity Methodist Episcopal church, of Mt. Gilead; the M. E. church, of Oberlin; the Methodist Episcopal church, of Gilboa, Putnam county; the Sharon Methodist Episcopal church, of Putnam county; the M. E. church, of Leipsic; the United Presbyterian Congregation, of Mansfield; the First Presbyterian

church, of Niles; the Methodist Episcopal church, of Richwood, Union county; the Welsh Presbyterian church, of Venedocia, Van Wert county; the First Methodist church of Van Wert; the First Presbyterian church, of Edgerton; the Hazleton Baptist church, of Youngstown; the United Brethren Sunday school, of Helena, Sandusky county; the Brotherhood Class of First Church of Christ, Akron; the Akron Main St. M. E. church, of Akron; the First Congregational church, of Hudson; the Men's Bible Class of First Methodist Episcopal church of Cuyahoga Falls; the High St. M. E. church, of Barberton; protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause by the Convention.

The remonstrances were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petitions of Nelson Shook and one hundred other citizens of Allen county; of Louis Scherger and one hundred and eighty-one other citizens of Auglaize county; of Charley E. Tuley and two hundred and seventeen other citizens of Butler county; of Ed. Wods and fifty-nine other citizens of Carroll county; of R. H. Davis and one hundred and sixty-five other citizens of Clark county; of Tony Reinhardt and one hundred and thirty other citizens of Clermont county; of John G. Fox, of Columbiana county; of Frank E. Ring and thirty-nine other citizens of Cuyahoga county; of J. O. Lietz and one hundred and ninety-four other citizens of Cuyahoga county; of Ralph C. Seits and fifty other citizens of Erie county; of J. G. Hoffman and four other citizens of Fairfield county; of J. L. Strang and other citizens of Franklin county; of W. H. Forbes and one other citizen of Greene county; of J. C. Garver, of Hardin county; of E. B. Davis and one hundred and three other citizens of Hancock county; of John Laube and one hundred and ten other citizens of Hancock county; of E. A. Dowling and four hundred and fifty other citizens of Hamilton county; of Thomas Bell and ten other citizens of Hocking county; of Guy Spriggs and other citizens of Jackson county; of F. B. Naylor and nine other citizens of Lake county; of Wm. D. Kelly and twenty-three other citizens of Lawrence county; of A. H. Whack and seventy-four other citizens of Lorain county; of Peter Cook and two hundred and seventy-six other citizens of Lucas county; of Richard Simpson and fifty-two other citizens of Mahoning county; of Julius Epple and eighty-four other citizens of Meigs county; of F. W. Smith and twenty-nine other citizens of Mercer county; of C. S. Young and one thousand and seventy-five other citizens of Montgomery county; of D. L. McDowell and twenty-three other citizens of Ottawa county; of C. F. Ryan and twenty-one other citizens of Pickaway county; of John Hughes and twelve other citizens of Pike county; of J. C. Rhine and other citizens of Portage county; of A. W. Bell and seventy other citizens of Putnam county; of Geo. W. Cunningham and eighteen other citizens of Seneca county; of Louis Weingartner and thirty-eight other citizens of Shelby county; of W. H. Carter, of Summit county; of B. A. Hart and fifteen other citizens of Trumbull county; of Frank Long and

Petitions and Memorials.

twenty-three other citizens of Van Wert; of L. I. Reed and other citizens of Warren county; of D. C. Sprague and thirty-two other citizens of Washington county; of R. W. Henderson and twenty-seven other citizens of Wayne county; of R. C. Shaumleffel and other citizens of Wood county; relative to Proposal No. 4, introduced by Mr. King.

The petitions were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrances of A. Forney and other citizens of Cuyahoga county; of E. M. Spring, of Cleveland; of O. H. Gilbert, of Hicksville; of E. G. Dietz, of Hicksville; of C. W. Morrison, of Delaware; of G. L. Bogart, of Bellefontaine; of G. H. Becker, of Montpelier; of C. E. Gibson and two hundred other citizens of Forest, Hardin county; of N. H. Fultz, of Bellefontaine; of J. H. Greggs, Bellefontaine; of C. W. Hoffman, of Bellefontaine; of S. G. Davis, Paulding; of T. I. Heinlein, Delaware; of J. E. Thompson, of Sidney; of James R. Connor, Garrettsville; of Peter Dietz, Hicksville; of P. R. Rhodes, Hicksville; of A. G. Carter, of Bellefontaine; of F. Sartwell and forty-two other citizens of North Ridgeville, Lorain county; of R. N. Wilson and other citizens of Leipsic, Putnam county; of Pulaski Township Law and Order League, of Williams county; of E. A. Hartman and thirty-seven other citizens of Williams county; protesting against any action upon the liquor question without fullest discussion, and protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestrictive license clause by the Convention.

The remonstrances were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrance of the Sabbath school of the Forest Congregational church, of Newton Falls, Trumbull county; of an organization of West Cairo, Allen county; of the First Congregational church, of Newton Falls; of the Evangelical Bible School of Lindsey, Sandusky county; of the Bible class Trinity M. E. church of Youngstown; of the First Christian church of Lexington, Richland county; of the Mayflower Memorial church, of Mansfield; of the First Congregational church, of Cleveland; of the Methodist churches of Defiance; protesting against any change being made in our state constitution whereby the present prohibition laws may be nullified or curtailed.

The remonstrances were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the remonstrances of the Rev. A. E. Yeager and congregation of Madison; of the Rev. W. R. Arnold and seventy-two other citizens of Hardin county; of the M. E. church of Kent; of the Methodist Congregation of Ravenna; of the Church of Christ, of Ravenna; of the First Congregational church, of Marysville, protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestrictive clause by the Convention.

The remonstrances were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of the Columbus Equal Suffrage association of Columbus, asking that the question of woman's suffrage be referred to the people of the state for vote; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Davio presented the petition of Chas. R. Otto and thirty-nine other citizens of Cuyahoga county, requesting

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

Mr. Fackler presented the petition of many citizens of Cuyahoga county protesting against the submission of a mandatory, unrestrictive license clause by the Convention; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Farrell presented the petition of C. C. Philpott and thirty-nine other citizens of Cuyahoga county, requesting the adoption of Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Halfhill presented the petitions of John A. Walton and sixty other citizens of Lima, Allen county, and of H. J. Jettinghoff and sixty other citizens of Van Wert, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Kilpatrick presented the petition of F. C. McConnell and seventy-two other citizens of Trumbull county, in favor of license of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

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

Mr. Pierce presented the petitions of Stanley Peters and one hundred and thirty-two other citizens of Butler county; of George H. Sebald and one hundred and nineteen other citizens of Butler county, asking that the traffic in intoxicating liquors in this state should be licensed, and requesting the adoption of Proposal No. 4; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Redington presented the petition of H. H. Linnbach and many other citizens of Lorain county, in favor of license law; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Stilwell presented the petition of O. G. Nicholas and forty other citizens of Cuyahoga county, in favor of liquor license; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Nye presented the petition of Oberlin College Equal Suffrage League, of one hundred members, and other citizens of Oberlin, requesting submission of amendment to give women equal suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Davio presented the petition of Cataract Lodge No. 2 of A. A. of I. S. & T. W. requesting the adoption of a weekly pay day clause in the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Labor.

Mr. Doty presented the petition of Cataract Lodge No. 2 of A. A. of I. S. & T. W. requesting the adoption of a weekly pay day clause in the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Labor.

Mr. Miller, of Fairfield, presented the petition of Mrs. Sallie Flegel and two hundred citizens of Fairfield county, asking for the prohibition in the manufacture and sale of cigarettes; which was referred to the committee of the Whole.

Mr. Fackler presented the petition of A. R. Teachout and other citizens of Cuyahoga county, asking for the prohibition in the manufacture and sale of cigarettes; which was referred to the committee of the Whole.

Mr. Kerr presented the petition of Charles McAfee and other citizens of Jefferson county, asking the follow-

Petitions and Memorials.

ing provisions be included in the new constitution: Bill of rights, direct legislation and the recall of public officers; which was referred to the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights.

Mr. Rorick presented the petition of W. E. Fowler and ninety-three other citizens of Delta, Fulton county, asking for the prohibition in the manufacture, sale and distribution of cigarettes; which was referred to committee of the Whole.

Mr. Stilwell presented the petitions of Albert Eisle and forty other citizens; of Sam DeGraw and thirty-nine other citizens; of James Koryta and Chas. Block and seventy-eight other citizens; all of Cuyahoga county, relative to licensing the liquor traffic; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Knight presented the petitions of Mrs. Anna Cave and S. C. Morrison and many other citizens of Franklin county, relative to elective franchise; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Colton presented the petitions of Thos. Delahanty and one hundred other citizens; also of A. H. Shaffrank and seventy-nine other citizens; of John Lavin and one hundred seven other citizens; of J. L. Flanigan and one hundred nineteen other citizens; of C. H. Newman and seventy-eight other citizens, all of Cuyahoga county; asking for the licensing of the liquor traffic and the passage of Proposal No. 4; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Stilwell presented the petitions of Val P. Wolf; of Richard F. Meyerheine; of Jos. B. Rose; of Eugene Weinberger; of Jas. Dunlavey; of James Drazdels; of George Denk; of Wm. Lampe; of M. W. Heetz; of John A. Leary and three hundred twenty-five other citizens of Cuyahoga county, asking for the licensing of the liquor traffic; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petitions of Sarah E. Klingler, president of the W. C. T. U. of Junction City; the Calvery Lutheran church, of Springfield; the members of the South Charleston W. C. T. U. of South Charleston; the First Presbyterian church, of Xenia; of the Rev. F. D. Ward and members of the M. E. church, of Penfield; of the United Brethren in Christ church, of Rising Sun; of J. D. Woods, superintendent of a Sunday school, of Georgesville; of the Friends Sunday school of Ludlow Falls; of Mrs. E. J. Bose, president of the Dio Lewis W. C. T. U. of Columbus; of the Defiance College and School of Theology of Defiance, which has a membership of three hundred fifty students, also the members of the Broadway Christian church of Defiance; of the Sandusky County W. C. T. U. of Fremont; of the Reformed Sunday school of Lindsey; of Henry Hall, of Huron; of the Presbyterian church, of Huron; of the W. C. T. U. of Oberlin; of the Presbyterian church of Columbiana; of M. E. LeSourd, of Bellefontaine; of Matthew G. Dick, of Oberlin; of H. G. Ashburn, of Cincinnati; of W. R. Manock, of Huron; of the Methodist Episcopal church, of Columbiana; of A. C. Alleshouse, superintendent of schools, of Huron; of the W. C. T. U. of Stanton, Fayette county; of East Side W. C. T. U., of Delaware; of Ray S. Ball, of Huron; of the Center Quarterly Meeting of Friends, held at Wilmington; of J. S. Altman, of Belle Center; of the Farmers'

Institute of Pleasant township, Clark county; of the United Presbyterian church, of Huntsville; of the First M. E. church, of Marysville; of two hundred seventy-six citizens of Hancock county; of Coshocton Methodist Protestant church, of Coshocton; of six hundred fifty church members of Winchester, Adams county; of the members of the Trinity Evangelical Sabbath school, of Sandusky county; of M. E. Cunningham, of Picketon; of a mass meeting at Flushing; of one thousand members of St. Paul's Lutheran church of Bucyrus; of the United Brethren Sunday school, of Union City, Ind.; of R. W. Chamberlain, of East Palestine; of the Cleveland Heights M. E. church; of Asbury M. E. church, of Delaware; of St. Paul's M. E. church, of Tiffin; of the Evangelical church, of Belmore; of the Men's Club of the Epworth Memorial M. E. church, of Cleveland; of the St. Paul's M. E. church, of Toledo, protesting against the passage of a mandatory, unrestricted license clause in the constitution; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petition of Mr. Dolan, and members of Carpenter's Union No. 11, of Cleveland, asking for the passage of the initiative, referendum and recall and woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee of the Whole.

The Montgomery county delegates presented the petition of four thousand five hundred citizens of Montgomery county, favoring the passage of the King proposal without amendment; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Stokes presented the petition of Harley Paff and fifty-nine other citizens of Montgomery county, favoring Proposal No. 4; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Thomas presented the petition of Frank J. Vacha and five hundred sixteen other citizens of Cuyahoga county, asking for the licensing of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Marshall presented the petition of Jas. Hagan and nineteen other citizens of Coshocton county, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4, licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Harbarger presented the petition of Jacob Gleich and twenty other citizens of Franklin county, in favor of licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Watson presented the petition of H. M. Meredith and other citizens of Guernsey county, in favor of licensing liquors; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Harbarger presented the resolution of H. R. Coggins and three hundred sixty members West Park M. E. Sunday school, against the license clause being inserted in the constitution; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Harbarger presented the resolution of Avondale U. B. Sunday school against unrestricted licensing of the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Lampson presented the petition of H. B. Smith and thirty-five other citizens of Ashtabula county, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4 licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Petitions and Memorials—Motions and Resolutions—Introduction of Proposals.

Mr. Lampson presented the petition of John J. Farrell and forty other citizens of Ashtabula county, asking for the adoption of Proposal No. 4, licensing the liquor traffic; which was referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. Pettit presented the petition of Henry Dickens and two hundred eighty-eight other citizens of Cincinnati, and other citizens of Hamilton county, praying for woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Harbarger presented the petition of Union No. 11, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Cleveland, relative to the initiative and referendum, the recall and suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Initiative and Referendum.

Mr. Pettit presented the petition of Mary H. R. Rice and one hundred and forty-three other citizens of Cincinnati, asking for woman's suffrage; which was referred to the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

Mr. Bigelow presented the petitions of the First Methodist Episcopal church of Wapakoneta; of Kirke L. Cowdery, of Oberlin; of the Methodist Ministers' Association, of Cincinnati; of the Baptist Ministers' Association, of Cleveland; of the Disciple Ministerial Association, of Cleveland, protesting against any license clause in the constitution; which were referred to the committee on Liquor Traffic.

Mr. STAMM: I offer a resolution.
The resolution was read as follows:
Resolution No. 60:

Be it resolved, That the officers of the unskilled, migratory and casual workers association called "Hoboes" be invited to address this assembly at any time their relief from business pressure will permit. That a committee of three, consisting of the members of Hamilton county, Mr. Harris, Mr. Bowdle and Mr. FitzSimons, of Cuyahoga county, be appointed to invite and escort them to this Convention.

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

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. DAVIO: I offer a resolution.
The resolution was read as follows:
Resolution No. 61:

Resolved, That the president of this Convention extend to the Hon. Eugene V. Debs an invitation to address this Convention at his earliest convenience.

The resolution was laid over under the rule.

Mr. HAHN: I move that the vote whereby the report of the committee recommending the indefinite postponement of Proposal No. 38 was agreed to, be now reconsidered. I move that further consideration of the motion be postponed until Wednesday.

The motion was lost.

Mr. STOKES: I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The motion was carried.

Mr. HAHN: I move that the vote whereby the report of the committee recommending the indefinite postpone-

ment of Proposal No. 39 was agreed to, be now reconsidered.

Mr. KING: I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The motion was carried.

Mr. HAHN: I move that the vote whereby the report of the committee recommending the indefinite postponement of Proposal No. 45 was agreed to be now reconsidered.

The motion was lost.

The president announces the appointment of Raymond Stremel as page, chosen from the Soldiers' and Sailors' Orphans' Home at Xenia.

Mr. EBY: I move that the vote whereby resolution No. 48 was laid on the table be now reconsidered.

The motion was lost.

Mr. WINN: I offer a resolution.
The resolution was read as follows:
Resolution No. 62:

WHEREAS, There are obvious advantages in permitting the voters as far as possible to render an independent judgment upon each proposed change in the constitution. Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the proposals adopted by this Convention be restricted to the subjects which correspond to the names of the seventeen standing committees as follows: Agriculture, Banks and Banking, Corporations other than Municipal, County and Township Organizations, Education, Elective Franchise, Good Roads, Initiative and Referendum, Judiciary and Bill of Rights, Labor, Legislative and Executive Departments, Liquor Traffic, Method of Amending the Constitution, Municipal Government, Public Works, Short Ballot, and Taxation.

Resolved, That if two or more proposals bearing upon any one subject be adopted by the Convention, that these proposals be submitted in a group under their proper title. And, further,

Be it resolved, That the committee on Submission and Address to the People be instructed, in pursuance of this plan, to prepare, in co-operation with the chairman of the various committees a pamphlet containing the text of each amendment proposed with a statement of the reason of the Convention in proposing each change and to report a plan of placing this pamphlet as far as practicable with all the voters of the state.

The resolution was laid over under the rule.

INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSALS.

The following proposals were introduced and read the first time:

Proposal No. 212 — Mr. Johnson, of Williams. To submit an amendment to article II, section 16, of the constitution. — Relative to amending the veto power of the governor.

Proposal No. 214 — Mr. Eby. To submit an amendment to article VII, of the constitution. — Relative to public school funds.

Proposal No. 214 — Mr. Eby. To submit an amendment to article XVI, of the constitution. — Relative to amending the constitution.

Introduction of Proposals, Etc.—Committee Reports Relative to Telephone Attendants.

Proposal No. 215—Mr. Woods. To submit an amendment to article II, section 1, of the constitution. — Relative to initiative and referendum.

Proposal No. 216—Mr. Anderson. To submit an amendment to section 18 of the schedule of the constitution. — Relative to the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

Proposal No. 217—Mr. Hoffman. To submit an amendment to the constitution. — Relative to municipal corporations.

Proposal No. 218—Mr. Worthington. To submit an amendment to article XII, section 16, of the constitution. — Relative to the veto power.

Proposal No. 219—Mr. Mauck. To amend section 1, article XVI. — Relative to methods of amending the constitution.

Proposal No. 220—Mr. Knight. To submit an amendment to article II, section 16, of the constitution. — Relative to veto power of the governor.

Proposal No. 221—Mr. Miller, of Fairfield. To submit an amendment to the constitution. Relating to the sale of stocks, bonds and securities.

Proposal No. 222—Mr. Miller, of Fairfield. To submit an amendment to section 18 of the schedule of the constitution. — Relative to the liquor traffic.

Proposal No. 223—Mr. Elson. To submit an amendment to article IV, section 3, of the constitution. — Relative to the sessions of the common pleas court.

Proposal No. 224—Mr. Farrell. To submit an amendment to article XVII, section 1, of the constitution. — Relative to election of state and county officers.

Proposal No. 225—Mr. Halfhill. To amend sections 1, 3, 4, 12 and 15, of article IV, and to abolish or repeal sections 7 and 8, of article IV, so that each county will elect at least one judge of the court of common pleas, which court shall have probate and testamentary jurisdiction.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: I move that Proposal No. 152 be withdrawn from the committee on Judiciary and Bill of Rights and transferred to the committee on Agriculture.

The motion was carried.

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEES OF PROPOSALS.

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

Proposal No. 210—Mr. Smith, of Geauga. To the committee on Taxation.

Proposal No. 211—Mr. Taggart. To the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. Roehm submitted the following report:

The standing committee on Employes, to which was referred the motion of Mr. Thomas, with instructions to investigate, beg leave to report as follows:

That if Messrs. Stokely and Williams, telephone attendants, are lobbyists, the investigation of the committee has failed to develop that fact; and that the only question for the Convention to decide is whether it is desirable to rescind the latter part of

Resolution No. 27, by Mr. Hoskins, adopted January 18. (Page 1, journal.)

JOHN ROEHM,
W. S. HARRIS,
B. F. WEYBRECHT.

Mr. Tetlow submitted the following minority report:

The undersigned members of committee on Employes, to which the motion of Mr. Thomas and the subject matter contained therein was referred, beg to report as follows:

In submitting this report we have no desire to reflect upon the character, integrity or efficiency of the present attendants of the telephone booths, but, after due consideration, and investigation of the entire subject, recommend that part of Resolution No. 27 by Mr. Hoskins, which provides for the telephone company to furnish telephone attendants, be rescinded, and the sergeant-at-arms be directed to detail one of the persons now under his control to act as attendant to the telephone booths.

FRANK G. HURSH,
PERCY TETLOW.

Mr. THOMAS: I have no desire for a lengthy discussion upon this subject, but I simply want to state the reasons why I believe the minority report should be adopted. The motion that I introduced here the other evening was that we dispense with the services of the telephone employes as attendants in the smoking room and that the committee on Employes hire one of the regular employes to do that work. The cause for submitting said resolution was due to the discussion following the dismissal of the former attendant, Mr. Val Stokely, for some years attendant on the senate, the senate having refused to employ him last year. The reason for the refusal of the senate to employ Mr. Stokely was due to the fact that the senators mistrusted the telephone employes. They were personal lobbyists for the Bell Telephone Company rather than attendants. The senate last year employed no attendants. When an attendant is sent here that employe is required to act, not merely as an attendant, but as a personal information bureau for the telephone company. Charges against the telephone company were made on the floor of the senate. Three years ago it was necessary for the legislature in making the law for public service corporations, to transmit messages over Bell lines. The telephone attendants got these conversations between the members and made them public.

The following article appeared in the Columbus Dispatch, not of yesterday but a week ago yesterday, on the subject:

Some time the Constitutional Convention may have the laugh on the telephone companies. Just now the laugh is the other way.

It will be remembered that not long since one Simon Cronin, of Akron, life-time lobbyist for telephone interests of the state, quietly ensconced himself in the smoking room of the Convention hall, as a telephone "attendant", and with chuckles of secret glee allowed to pass clear over him the big reform wave which swept all other lobbyists clear out into the statehouse corridors.

Committee Reports Relative to Telephone Attendants.

It will be remembered, too, how somebody happened to discover Simon, and how great was his chagrin and the Convention's glee when it unceremoniously told the telephone people that he must give up his cozy berth.

The Convention innocently thought it had the laugh on somebody, but from out of the thin air there appeared one Val Stokely of Greenville, Ohio, and hardly had Simon slipped out when Val slipped in. Val is now one of the telephone attendants, operating unmolested in the sacred precincts of the smoking room, where the big state secrets often are discussed and from which all lobbyists are sternly barred. And now it's Val who is chuckling and the telephone people are still laughing in their sleeves.

Val Stokely is not quite as well known as a lobbyist as is his friend Simon Cronin, but when it comes to real log-rolling, the Greenville man is by no means to be scorned. The strange thing about it has been, is and always will be, that the telephone people should employ men of long experience as lobbyists to attend to the very simple task of answering telephone calls and summoning delegates when they are asked for.

That the telephone people don't intend to be easily balked, is shown by the appearance of Stokely the moment Cronin was fired. Most people aren't able to prove much difference between the lobbying abilities of one or the other. The significant feature is that the telephone people are so insistent in putting trained and high-salaried men at simple tasks.

It requires no stretch of memory to hark back to the time, two or three years ago, when the Ohio senate, tired of the practice of having lobbyists as telephone attendants in the confidential precincts of the smoking room, fired all the people sent over by the telephone companies and placed state employes in charge of the lines. Up to that time the telephone people had argued that none but the men sent by them could possibly answer 'phone calls. But senate pages did.

So a movement has been started by certain delegates in the Constitutional Convention toward firing all the telephone "attendants" sent by the companies, and putting Convention employes in their places.

Mr. Donovan, who wrote that article and who is now on the floor, appeared before the committee and backed up his statements that he had written that article to the letter, and refused to take back one word in regard to the matter. I also call attention to the fact that it was not only the privacy of telephone conversations that was interfered with by the employe in the smoking room, but that every private conversation between members and members' friends became the property of the telephone company if it in any way affected their interests. The senators were very emphatic in their statements. I met Senator Green of Coshocton County, president pro tem of the senate. He was just as emphatic in his statements as the other senators that the reason they had removed the telephone employes as attendants was that they were formerly lobbyists for the telephone

corporations. This Convention in its organization adopted certain rules excluding lobbyists as such from the house during the session of the Convention. The Bell Telephone Company will have the advantage of possessing information by violating these rules, through having an agent in the smoking room. If you will go to any other office, private or public, where telephone companies are required to furnish telephone attendants, you will find young men performing the service. There are enough young men employed by this Convention who could do this work; there is no reason why any other men should be employed at all. It is the public-service corporations, looking for special privileges and always grasping for more, that are responsible for all the corruption, whether in national, state or municipal legislatures. This Bell Telephone Company—

Mr. PECK: I want to inquire whether all this conversation about these telephone operators did not arise out of a fight of the telephone companies each making a fight against the other?

Mr. THOMAS: I will say to Mr. Peck that both telephone companies are one at the present time—practically one at the time that these charges were made against Stokely—they were in the process of merging at that time.

Mr. PECK: Merging like cats.

A DELEGATE: Isn't it a fact, Mr. Thomas, that the Federation of Labor has asked you to make this investigation?

Mr. THOMAS: No, sir.

Mr. EBY: Isn't it a fact that this attack on Mr. Stokely is the outgrowth of a political fight in Darke county?

Mr. THOMAS: No, sir. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that the charge made by one of the telephone employes that the socialists are mixed up with the democrats seems so silly it is hardly necessary to answer it.

Mr. LAMPSON: I don't know anything about this at all, but I think the main point is whether the man actually is a lobbyist or not, or whether he is simply performing his duties as a telephone operator? I don't care what faction he belongs to. I want to ask if the member from Cuyahoga has been lobbied by this operator?

Mr. THOMAS: No, sir.

Mr. LAMPSON: I would like to ask if any member on this floor has been lobbied with?

Mr. FESS: I should like to know whether this man was dropped by the senate? The committee reported that there was no foundation.

Mr. THOMAS: I will say that the matter was decided by democratic caucus that selected the employes for the senate last year.

Mr. EBY: Wasn't the fight in the democratic caucus led by the democratic senator from Upper Sandusky on account of Mr. Stokely working against him two years ago?

Mr. THOMAS: I am told that the fight was started by Senator Yount of Darke county. It was largely due to the fact that the Bell Telephone Company tried to defeat him for election.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: I would like to ask if this order was from the sessions of the senate?

Mr. THOMAS: I would say in answer to that, Mr. President, that the senators who are responsible for not

Committee Reports Relative to Telephone Attendants.

having Mr. Stokely as attendant had no charges against him of any kind whatsoever. They were looking after the interests of the people in the senate last year.

Mr. HOSKINS: I would like to know whether or not you question the truth of the majority report or the minority report here? You concede that these reports are true. Both state that they have not found that these men are lobbyists. Are the reports of these committees true, or do you insist on your former charge that this man is a lobbyist?

Mr. THOMAS: I understand that these men are looked upon in this house as lobbyists, if you like to call them such; but I insist, Mr. President, on the adoption of the minority report because of my belief that these men are hired by the telephone company and I would class them as lobbying for the telephone company.

Mr. HOSKINS: Do you accept the report of these two committees or do you charge them here as untrue? Answer that question.

Mr. THOMAS: I would like to have the minority report read.

The report was again read.

Mr. HOSKINS: The minority report states distinctly that from the evidence brought before the committee they considered it to be the best interest of this Convention that Mr. Hoskins' resolution should be rescinded and the Convention employ its own attendants.

Mr. HOSKINS: Don't that minority report say in truth that these men are not lobbyists?

Mr. THOMAS: No; I don't think so.

Mr. HOSKINS: I will ask you if you didn't appear before that committee to sustain your charge?

Mr. THOMAS: Yes, sir.

Mr. HOSKINS: Does that report sustain your charge?

Mr. THOMAS: Yes, sir; I wouldn't ask for his removal if it didn't.

Mr. HOSKINS: Does the minority report sustain your charge?

Mr. THOMAS: Not entirely.

Mr. HOSKINS: Were you ever a lobbyist yourself?

Mr. THOMAS: No, sir; not in the sense these gentlemen are. The question for the members to determine is whether these men are here in behalf of labor bills as lobbyists, or whether they are lobbyists or not. That is the question. I have said that they are both lobbyists.

Mr. ANDERSON: I would like to know what secrets there could be in that room or anywhere else, for that matter, around there that any man should not overhear?

Mr. THOMAS: I will ask the member from Mahoning county the same question he asked me the other day, Mr. President, and I told him that this Convention had adopted certain rules and regulations that prohibited any one from the Bell Telephone Company, as well as other corporations, on the floor of this Convention and in the smoking room as well—prohibited any lobbying whatever, of any kind—and I don't care to see the American Bell Telephone Company monopoly get any special privileges on this floor. As far as I am concerned I don't care what they hear.

Mr. ANDERSON: I will ask the same question if the gentleman will answer. What is the secret?

Mr. THOMAS: None at all. Then, if the members

so desire it, the bars should be thrown down and these rules rescinded, everyone of them, I say. The Bell Telephone Company started right out at the outset to violate the first rules that we made and sent in those chief lobbyists as attendants, and the fact that when the first one was recalled they followed it up by sending another shows conclusively that that company has no respect for the rules or anything else of this Convention, and I think for that reason the members ought to adopt the minority report.

Mr. HARRIS, of Ashtabula: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I have at least two regrets in connection with this matter. The first is that that matter was ever raised in the Convention at all, for I cannot see how in any possible way the dignity of this Convention is going to be enhanced by this discussion. Second, inasmuch as the matter has been referred to the Employes committee I am sorry that it seems to be impossible to secure a unanimous report. The committees have reported that there was no justification or excuse for the charges that were made here on this floor. The member from Cuyahoga [Mr. THOMAS] appeared before the committee before the committee was allowed to give a report. They had Mr. Donovan there, and Mr. Donovan didn't make any pretense of seriousness in what he had written. I think, taking the reports in so far as the matter of the conduct of these gentlemen are concerned in connection with this Convention, the reports agree exactly—that they have done nothing wrong and have said nothing which would justify us in dismissing them from their places as telephone attendants in the Convention. Now, gentlemen, in all kindness don't saddle this upon these gentlemen. It is not right that we should embarrass them or reflect upon their character. Let us look at this matter in the right light.

Mr. FOX: I would like to make a statement concerning Mr. Stokely. I live just a short distance from Greenville and get in touch with the business men of Greenville every week, and I know that the greatest business men, the best men of Greenville, made the statement that it was a political scheme for spite and not fair treatment at all, and they were satisfied that this man was innocent in every way.

Mr. ROEHM: As one of the signers of the majority report, I would like to say that we concluded that the charge of lobbying had not been sustained or that the charge that Stokely was a lobbyist had not been sustained. In neither report did we find that these men were at fault, but the recommendation of the minority report would cast blame upon these two men. Our report, the majority report, was introduced and the attention of the Convention called to the fact that the question was whether they wanted to rescind certain resolutions or not. Now, I think that the majority report should be received by this Convention, and if they afterward desire to rescind the resolution they can do so without reflecting upon the character of any person here. So far as the charges preferred in connection with the man or men concerned, they have not been in a judicial manner sustained before the committee. The nearest they came to it aside from their being employed by the telephone company as attendants, was the fact that Mr. Stokely had been dismissed from the senate, and it developed that that was due entirely to a political scheme of Senator Yount,

Committee Reports Relative to Telephone Attendants.

of Darke county, whom Mr. Stokely had opposed twice for senator.

Mr. TETLOW: As a minority member of that committee I want to state my position clearly that every member of this Convention will understand why I offered a minority report and the reasons for it. There surely is some misunderstanding when a committee will divide itself and report a division. There is a reason. I am willing to assign the reason why, as minority members of that committee, we submitted that report as we did. The question for this committee to decide, Mr. President, is not the charges that were made upon this floor. The proposition that was submitted to the committee on Employes was the motion by Mr. Thomas, from Cuyahoga. That motion provides as follows:

Mr. Thomas moved that the Convention dispense with the services of both the telephone companies' employes as telephone attendants in the smoking room and that the committee on Employes be directed to assign one of the regular employes for this work.

The committee took this up without a question of some of the charges made upon this floor, no charges being embodied in this resolution. After due consideration — and I want to say there were some things said that did not reflect to the credit of some of the people employed by this telephone company, and I am willing to state clearly my position so that there can be no misunderstanding. As to the matter of charges, I want to say also that there was no testimony given to prove that these men were lobbyists in any sense of the word at this time. There was testimony introduced that showed that in the past this telephone company had exercised its power over the telephone attendants and that they had been lobbyists in the previous session of the general assembly. I would not do anything to injure the character of those men or reflect upon them as men and have no desire to do so, but there is involved in this proposition something that means something. It is not a question of whether or not this telephone company is going to have a special privilege not given to any other organization in the state.

Why is it this telephone company will send two men of the qualifications and character of these men, filling responsible positions in their respective companies, here to act as page boys, as it were? I want to make this statement in answer to the member from Ashtabula — that there is not a man in this Convention who could not do this work. It does not require an expert attendant to do that. These men are not required to make connections to different parts of the state; they simply call central and get your party for you and call you when they have your party on the line.

I think merely a page boy of fifteen or sixteen years of age can fill the position. I think, as a matter of protection to this Convention, this Convention should adopt the minority report so that in the future there can be no reflection cast upon them.

Mr. LAMPSON: We must take into consideration the services of these gentlemen to members of this Convention; it takes experience to operate a long distance telephone.

Mr. HURSH: I have been informed that any person with reasonable intelligence can perform this duty.

Mr. LAMPSON: If the gentleman don't think it requires considerable experience — that a person can render good service with long distance lines without experience, he would soon find out if it were left to one not familiar with it. I would like to have some information as to what we want to be protected from? Are we in danger of being seduced?

Mr. TETLOW: No.

Mr. LAMPSON: What special privilege is it that we want to be protected from?

Mr. TETLOW: This Convention passed a resolution in which it provided that only certain people would be allowed the floor of this Convention. Through a resolution introduced on the floor of the Convention a right was given to the telephone people that was not given to any other people in the state. That telephone company has two representatives here representing the telephone companies in the smoking room of this house.

Mr. LAMPSON: Now, what is the telephone company asking from this Convention?

Mr. TETLOW: It is not what the telephone company is asking from this Convention; it is what this Convention is giving to the telephone company.

Mr. LAMPSON: What do you propose to give to the telephone company.

Mr. TETLOW: I propose to give them no more and no less than I would give to any one else.

Mr. LAMPSON: Hasn't the Bell Telephone company sent to us two expert operators? In other words, this company has tried to give us good service by sending two expert operators.

Mr. TETLOW: I want to say that the telephone company has not acted fairly with this Convention, and that is the reason I take the position that I do. I want to say that in reference to this question the committee has a number of facts in the matter, and there is no question in my mind that when the Elson telephone measure was up in the senate there was a great deal of lobbying done in behalf of that particular measure. This will go to all parts of the state and to other states that this Convention has made this exception; that we have permitted the telephone company to fasten itself upon this Convention — upon this house — and if we cannot prevent it it will enable the newspapers to print things just as they did two years ago.

Mr. HALFHILL: Will the member state what it is any newspaper or anybody else can fasten upon this Convention for that telephone company? I understood you to say that you didn't want to be in a position that the newspapers could say that the telephone company had fastened something on this Convention. What did you mean by that? Does the gentleman mean that there is any member of this Convention to be corrupted?

Mr. TETLOW: No; I am not making that statement.

Mr. HALFHILL: What did you mean by that statement?

Mr. TETLOW: I don't want to convey that idea. I think the statements I have made are very plain, and if a man wants to understand them he can. The fact of the matter is that I made the statement specific, that this company had two men in this smoking room as telephone at-

Committee Reports Relative to Telephone Attendants—Reports of Standing Committees.

tendants which any ordinary boy could fill, and the men there have been charged in the past with being lobbyists.

Mr. HALFHILL: Well, I ask now are you afraid to meet the men, or have any men of this Convention meet the men or any other man from this Convention?

Mr. TETLOW: No.

Mr. HALFHILL: Very well, then.

Mr. TETLOW: No; I am not.

Mr. HALFHILL: Then I ask, why are you afraid of the newspapers wrongfully charging something?

Mr. TETLOW: I am not. I want to say this in answer. I take this position that I am not going to grant, if I can prevent it, any special privileges to them that I cannot revoke. When this resolution was adopted some time ago granting the special privilege, I did not understand what it meant, but I do understand it now, and I want to rescind that part of the resolution which grants that special privilege.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: I move an indefinite postponement of this question.

Mr. MAUCK: I move the previous question.

The motion was carried and the main question ordered.

The PRESIDENT: The question now is "Shall the minority report be agreed to?"

The yeas and nays were taken, and resulted—yeas 27, nays 78, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Cassidy,	Harter, Huron,	Stewart,
Davio,	Hoffman,	Stilwell,
Doty,	Hursh,	Tallman,
Elson,	Kunkel,	Tannehill,
Farrell,	Leslie,	Tetlow,
FitzSimons,	Moore,	Thomas,
Hahn,	Pierce,	Ulmer,
Halenkamp,	Smith, Hamilton,	Watson,
Harbarger,	Stevens,	Wise.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Anderson,	Fess,	Miller, Crawford,
Antrim,	Fluke,	Miller, Fairfield,
Baum,	Fox,	Norris,
Beatty, Morrow,	Halfhill,	Nye,
Beatty, Wood,	Harris, Ashtabula,	Okey,
Beyer,	Harris, Hamilton,	Peck,
Bowdle,	Harter, Stark,	Peters,
Brown, Highland,	Henderson,	Price,
Brown, Pike,	Holtz,	Read,
Campbell,	Hoskins,	Redington,
Cody,	Johnson, Williams,	Rockel,
Collett,	Jones,	Roehm,
Colton,	Keller,	Rorick,
Cordes,	Kerr,	Shaffer,
Crites,	King,	Shaw,
Cunningham,	Knight,	Smith, Geauga,
DeFrees,	Kramer,	Solether,
Donahay,	Lampson,	Stalter,
Dunlap,	Leete,	Stamm,
Dunn,	Longstreth,	Stokes,
Dwyer,	Ludey,	Taggart,
Earnhart,	Marriott,	Wagner,
Eby,	Marshall,	Walker,
Evans,	Matthews,	Winn,
Fackler,	Mauck,	Woods,
Farnsworth,	McClelland,	Worthington.

The minority report was disagreed to.

The majority report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: The question is shall the motion of Mr. Thomas "that the Convention dispense with the service of both telephone companies' attendants in the smoking room and that the committee on Employees be

directed to assign one of the regular employes for this work," be agreed to?

Mr. WOODS: I move that this resolution be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON: Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were taken, and resulted—yeas 74, nays 30, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Anderson,	Fluke,	Norris,
Antrim,	Fox,	Nye,
Baum,	Halfhill,	Peck,
Beatty, Morrow,	Harris, Ashtabula,	Peters,
Beatty, Wood,	Henderson,	Pettit,
Beyer,	Holtz,	Price,
Bowdle,	Hoskins,	Read,
Brown, Highland,	Johnson, Williams,	Redington,
Brown, Pike,	Jones,	Riley,
Campbell,	Kehoe,	Rockel,
Cody,	Keller,	Roehm,
Collett,	Kerr,	Rorick,
Colton,	King,	Shaffer,
Cordes,	Knight,	Shaw,
Crites,	Lampson,	Smith, Geauga,
Cunningham,	Leete,	Solether,
DeFrees,	Longstreth,	Stalter,
Doty,	Ludey,	Stamm,
Dunlap,	Marriott,	Stokes,
Dwyer,	Marshall,	Taggart,
Earnhart,	Matthews,	Wagner,
Eby,	Mauck,	Walker,
Elson,	McClelland,	Winn,
Farnsworth,	Miller, Crawford,	Woods.
Fess,	Miller, Fairfield,	

Those who voted in the negative are:

Cassidy,	Harter, Stark,	Stewart,
Davio,	Hoffman,	Stilwell,
Donahay,	Hursh,	Tallman,
Fackler,	Kunkel,	Tannehill,
Farrell,	Leslie,	Tetlow,
FitzSimons,	Moore,	Thomas,
Hahn,	Okey,	Ulmer,
Halenkamp,	Pierce,	Watson,
Harbarger,	Smith, Hamilton,	Wise,
Harris, Hamilton,	Stevens,	Worthington.

So the motion was carried.

Mr. Lampson submitted the following report:

The standing committee on Good Roads, to which was referred Proposal No. 149—Mr. Weybrecht, having had the same under consideration, reports it back and recommends that its further consideration be indefinitely postponed.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. Lampson submitted the following report:

The standing committee on Good Roads, to which was referred Proposal No. 173—Mr. Matthews, having had the same under consideration, reports it back and recommends that its further consideration be indefinitely postponed.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. Lampson submitted the following report:

The standing committee on Good Roads, to which was referred Proposal No. 22—Mr. Stewart, having had the same under consideration, reports it back and recommends that its further consideration be indefinitely postponed.

The report was agreed to.

Reports of Standing Committees.

Mr. Lampson submitted the following report:

The standing committee on Good Roads, to which was referred Proposal No. 60—Mr. Halfhill, having had the same under consideration, reports it back and recommends that its further consideration be indefinitely postponed.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. Lampson submitted the following report:

The standing committee on Good Roads, to which was referred Proposal No. 30—Mr. Smith, of Geauga, having had the same under consideration, reports it back and recommends that it be indefinitely postponed.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MATTHEWS: I move that the committee on Good Roads be relieved from further consideration of Proposal No. 73 and that said proposal be referred to the committee on Miscellaneous Subjects.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: I move to amend the motion by substituting "committee of the Whole" instead of "committee on Miscellaneous Subjects."

The amendment was agreed to.

The original motion as amended was agreed to.

Mr. READ: I move that we adjourn.

The motion was carried and the Convention adjourned.