

THIRTY-THIRD DAY

MORNING SESSION.

WEDNESDAY, March 6, 1912.

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment, was called to order by the president and opened with prayer by the Rev. Washington Gladden, of Columbus, Ohio. The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. LAMPSON: I move that two thousand extra copies of Proposal No. 151 by Mr. Anderson, as amended, be ordered printed.

The motion was carried.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The question before the house is Proposal No. 91, relating to equal suffrage. The secretary will read the proposal.

The proposal was read the second time.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the adoption of the proposal and the gentleman from Trumbull [Mr. KILPATRICK] has the floor.

Mr. KILPATRICK: I want to call your attention first, gentlemen, to the provisions of this Proposal No. 91.

The section of the constitution which is desired to be changed is article V, section 1. We leave out of that section just two words, "white male." What we are asking in this proposal, gentlemen, is this, that the proposition be submitted to the electors of this state whether or not they are in favor of equal suffrage — whether or not they are in favor of all of the people of this state exercising the right to vote, and have something to say about the government under which they live. I want to repeat, the only thing we are seeking here is that this proposition shall be submitted to the electors of the state — that is, to strike out these two words from the present article and section, "white male."

I assume, and I have the right to assume from what has transpired in this Convention hall since we have convened, that every member of this Convention is absolutely sincere. We may differ as to our views on propositions. We have differed as to our ideas in regard to certain propositions which have come up for discussion. But every man here is sincere. I am going to start, friends, with that premise — that we are all sincere.

This question which we are going to discuss this morning is a question which is fundamental so far as democratic government is concerned. To me, being a democratic democrat, this proposal is one of the greatest propositions that has come before this Convention for consideration. Because it is fundamental — it takes up the rights of the people, the rights of all of the people of this great state — this question of woman's suffrage in one sense is a new question so far as our state history is concerned. But in the United States this question has been up in some form for the past eighty years. I am not going to tire the members of this Convention by giving lengthy statistics on this question, but I want to call your attention particularly to some things which men who are considering this proposition ought to know if they are not aware of them already.

We have forty-eight states in this Union and there are

only twelve of those states which have not some form of equal suffrage, and with your indulgence I would like to name just a few of those states so that we can get some sort of an idea of the suffrage they have in the respective states of the Union.

In 1838 Kentucky gave equal suffrage to widows and children of school age; Kansas gave school suffrage; Wyoming, full suffrage; Michigan, school suffrage; Colorado and a great number of states, along in the seventies and eighties, gave school suffrage. Then a good many of the rest of the states have municipal suffrage and suffrage extended to tax-paying women.

I shall not take the time of the Convention to read all of these, but out of the forty-eight states there are only twelve which have not some kind of woman's suffrage.

So you see in this country that in the last eighty years this cause of democracy — the rights of the people — has been growing, and men who believe in democracy, men who have in their hearts true democracy, are beginning to see it is not a democracy in which we are living if we disfranchise one-half of the people.

Friends, it is our duty, if we believe in government by the people and of the people and for the people, to give women the right of suffrage. We have six states in the United States in which women have full suffrage. The last state was that great democratic state of California, which went forward with so many things which are progressive and which are truly democratic. California gave a large majority for equal suffrage. Oh, friends, if you men who are sitting in this Convention could only see what it means to this state, what it means to the cause of democracy in every other state, what it means to the cause of democracy in the United States, if this state of Ohio, our own state, could only be one of the leaders, if not the leader, in this section of the country in giving the women the right of franchise you would not hesitate to create right here in the center of the United States a democracy in very truth. Before I go further I want, if I may, to call your attention to what some of the great men and some of the great women, the men and women who were truly great and valuable to humanity, have had to say in regard to this proposition:

I'm in perfect harmony with the declaration of the American Federation of Labor, which has endorsed the demand that women be given the right to vote; that is, a suffrage equal to that now enjoyed by man.

It's a sure thing that any adult who is amenable to the laws of the country should have a voice in the making of those laws, under which he or she is governed. I have always stood for the square deal, and that's the only square thing on the woman suffrage question as I see it.—John Mitchell, ex-president United Mine Workers of America.

Now, friends, I want to call your attention especially to the statement which I am about to read. The state

Woman's Suffrage.

of Ohio has produced some truly great men. There have been in this state some great democrats—democratic democrats—but there is one man who in my estimation stands head and shoulders above them all; one man who in time to come we will look upon and to whom we shall point our children as being one of the greatest pioneers of democracy in this state; a man who was called away early in his life; that man who did more to free the American city than any other man because he has placed in our own state a city on the hill which throws its light out to every municipality in this country and all countries—that man and that great democrat was Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland. I want to read to you what he says in regard to this important proposition. I might say further in this connection that it has been my privilege to talk with him personally in regard to these things, and whenever it came to a question of democracy Tom Johnson was always favorable to democracy. Now listen, friends:

After all democracy is not a matter of sex, any more than it is a matter of race, color or previous conditions, but a matter of people. The more perfect the recognition of the common rights of all people, the more perfect and the more just the democracy. A truly enlightened and democratic form of government would of course recognize the equal rights of women.

Father Scully says:

The opposition to female suffrage is a matter of course. All great social and political reforms, as well as religious ones, have always been resisted by prejudice, customs and the old cry of "inopportune." So it is with this. It is a battle—reason and justice opposed by senseless fears and selfish notions. The cause is just. It may be defeated today, but never conquered, and tomorrow it will be victorious.

Israel Zangwill, that great Jew who has written so many books which have truly touched the heartstrings of thousands upon thousands of readers and who has done so much good toward upbuilding humanity, says:

There is no problem upon which an intelligent woman cannot throw some light. In neglecting woman's help, men are blundering not merely in what they do but still more badly in what they do not do; in the terribly important provinces of life which they leave untouched by legislation. We men require women's suffrage as much for our own sake as for women's sake.

Now I want to read you what the great democratic poet has to say, Edward Markham. We all know what he has done for democracy. We all know what he has done for the great cause of labor by sending out those beautiful thoughts of his clothed in language so expressive and filled with true democratic meaning:

The woman movement of this country is its most significant movement, because it brings human hearts together. We want not the rule of gold, but the Golden Rule. To carry this out in this world we need the help of the women. I am a very ardent woman suffragist.

I may with your indulgence give you a little idea of what sort of a man he is by giving a few lines written by him and which are very apropos of the subject under discussion:

Once, in a world that has gone down to dust,
I began to build a place by the sea,
White pillared, in a garden full of fountains.
The mock-birds in the tall magnolias sang;
And down all ways the Graces and the Joys
Went ever beckoning with wreathing arms,
The chisels and the hammers of the men
Were singing merrily among the stones,
And tower and gable arose against the sky.

A thousand friends,
All hastening to make ready for the feast,
Felt their light bodies whirling in the ball;
Were jesting and roaring at the tables spread
After the masquerade; were sleeping high
In perfumed chambers under the quiet stars;
When lo! a voice came crying through my heart;
"Leave all thou hast, and come and follow Me.

Then all at once the hammers and the tongues
Grew still around me, and the multitude—
The endless multitude that ache in chains
That we may have our laughter and our wine—
Rose spectral and dark to pass before my face.
I saw the labor-ruined forms of men;
Faces of women worn with many tears
Faces of little children old in youth.

I left the towers to crumble in the rain,
And waste upon the winds; my old-time friends
Flung back their fleering laughter after me.
I raised a low roof by a traveled road
And softly turned to give myself to man—
To open wells along a trodden way,
To build a wall against the sliding sand,
To raise a light upon a dangerous coast;
When suddenly I found me in a Palace
With God for Guest!

There in a Palace, fairer than my dream, I dwell:
High company come and go through distant sounding doors.

I want to read what William Lloyd Garrison had to say upon this proposition:

Those who are ruled by law should have the power to say what shall be the law and who the lawmakers. Women are as much interested in legislation as men, and are entitled to representation.

Now one more. I want to read you what Harriett Beecher Stowe had to say about this proposition. Everyone here knows what she did in regard to the great question of black slavery. This is what she says in regard to the abolition of white slavery:

If the principle on which we founded our government is true, that taxation must not be without representation, and if women held property and are taxed, it follows that women should be represented in the state by their vote. I think the state can no more afford to dispense with the votes of women in its affairs than the family.

How many men are there in this Convention hall who know how many women there are in the United States or in the state of Ohio that are working in the mills and

Woman's Suffrage.

in the factories and the sweatshops of this country? Do you know that down in Pennsylvania and in our own state — your state, if you please, and my state — there are women who are working in the rolling mills side by side with men? In Pennsylvania there are women working in the foundries, in the tube mills, in the tin mills, thousands of them. I am not going to take time to give the figures so far as the United States are concerned but in this state we have approximately three hundred thousand women who are working every day for their daily bread. Do you know that in the United States we have over two million boys and girls under the age of fourteen that are working in the mills and mines and sweatshops and factories? Do you realize what that means to the oncoming generations, our children and their children? If you could only see this question, if men could only be aroused to the situation and what this matter means by placing in the hands of all the people of the state and of all the people of the nation the right to govern themselves, we would not have a vote in this Convention against the initiative and referendum or against equal suffrage. And how can any man in this Convention who espouses the cause of the initiative and referendum conscientiously vote against the proposition of submitting this question to the electors? Every single labor organization in the United States that has passed upon this question of equal suffrage has done so in its favor. The Federation of Labor of twenty-three states have passed favorably upon this proposition. The Ohio Federation of Labor on October 13, 1911, passed a resolution, the resolving clause of which is as follows:

That the Ohio Federation of Labor, acting as a body and through the individual members, use every effort to secure from the coming convention the submission of the question of woman's suffrage as a separate proposition to be voted upon at the same time that the new constitution is to be acted upon.

The American Federation of Labor passed a resolution in favor of equal suffrage. I hold in my hand a telegram from Governor Hay, of the state of Washington, which I wish to read:

During the short time that woman suffrage has been in effect in this state a profound interest has been manifested among all women in the study of civic questions and the promotion of legislation and projects designed to advance the best interest of the people of the state. They are taking their responsibility seriously and providing a powerful agency of progress.

I have one from Governor Hawley, of Idaho, and I hold a letter here from Governor Shafroth, of Colorado. I also have one from Governor Carey, of Wyoming, and here is a letter from Governor Johnson, of California, in which he says:

I have your letter of December 5 relating to the suffrage amendment which the women of Ohio are preparing to present to your Constitutional Convention, and I note your request that I write you briefly my opinion of equal suffrage. I can

not do better than to say that since the adoption of the equal suffrage amendment in the state of California three important city elections have been held. One of these city elections, that of Los Angeles, was the most exciting and most bitterly contested ever held in the state, and, it was believed, fraught with the gravest consequences to that community. In these elections, the first test of equal suffrage with us, the women of California acquitted themselves with firmness, courage, ability, and with the very highest intelligence. If these elections are a fair indication of the practical working of equal suffrage, California will never regret the adoption of the amendment.

All of the letters which I hold from these various governors are strongly in favor of equal suffrage. They are too lengthy, however, to take your time with now.

There is another thing — one other man from whom I wish to quote, and he was, as you have heard before stated in this Convention hall, the greatest American, Abraham Lincoln:

God bless 'em." Don't know what we'd 'a' done if it hadn't been for the way the women have taken hold. Come down here willin' to do anything — women that never saw a cut finger before will stand over a wound so terrible men will faint at the sight of it. I've known of women spendin' whole nights on a battlefield huntin' for somebody they'd lost and stoppin' as they went to give water and take messages. I've known them to work steady for three days and nights without a wink of sleep down at the front after a battle, takin' care of the wounded. Here in Washington you can't stop 'em as long as they can see a thing to be done. At home they're supportin' the families and workin' day and night to help us. They give their husbands and their boys and then themselves. God bless the women. We can't save the Union without 'em.

It did not require a civil war, though, to make Abraham Lincoln appreciate women or to demand a "square deal" for them. Away back in 1836 he declared in a letter to his constituents: "I go for all sharing the privileges of government who assist in bearing the burdens, by no means excluding women."

And listen to this further. To me one of the greatest things Abraham Lincoln ever said was this: "All that I am and all that I hope to be I owe to my angel mother."

Is there a man in this Convention hall who says that he is greater than his mother? Is there a man here in this Convention hall who would have the audacity to say upon this floor that he knows more and has a better right, if you please, under our government to say what this government shall be than his mother? We sometimes forget that we are all a part of humanity and the time is coming, and I think the time is here, when you men are going to throw aside selfishness and superstition. This superstition is going to be thrown aside and we are going to appreciate the fact that we all belong to one human family. Many men say that the world pays homage to women and for that reason she ought not to be taken down from

Woman's Suffrage.

that high estate. If that were only true what a world this would be. True it is that there are certain women who possess the graces perhaps to whom man pays homage. But don't insult the thousands, aye the millions, of women who toil every day that they may keep body and soul together, who experience every day new sorrows and new humiliations and new sufferings. Don't, I say, insult these women by saying to them that they cannot have a right to exercise this franchise that men alone shall say under what conditions they shall live so far as voting goes. Give them the right to say for themselves. No matter what the ability of a woman may be, or what the experience of a woman may have been, she has just exactly the same inalienable right that man has. And, friends, the time is rapidly coming when the chains which have bound us to the wrongs of the past are going to be broken and civilization is giving us a better view of right, and we are beginning to appreciate that before Almighty God and the eternal bar of justice, women possess the same inherent rights that man does and that we have no right under this form of government, a democracy, to say to woman that she has no right to vote if she wants to. A man who says that in his heart is a tyrant, and invariably when you find a man or woman who is against equal suffrage you will find a man or a woman who is in favor of restricted man suffrage. They would have those people vote who they think are capable of voting, and that would be all. Such thoughts as that are tyrannical and they are productive of the very conditions which exist here in our own state and in our own nation today. If you believe in free speech let speech be free. If you believe in liberty, and you all do, give liberty. If you want to help democracy, give democracy. That is the thing to do. If you believe in equal rights for all give to the people of this state and the people of this nation equal rights.

During the speech of Mr. Kilpatrick Mr. Johnson, of Williams, took the chair as president pro tem.

Mr. BOWDLE: May I ask the gentleman a question?

The PRESIDENT PRO TEM: Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILPATRICK: Yes; I will answer if I can.

Mr. BOWDLE: Can you inform us what percentage of women desire to vote?

Mr. KILPATRICK: Mr. Bowdle, in my estimation it does not make any difference. If there is only one woman in this state who wants the right of franchise I would say she should have that right.

Mr. BOWDLE: Would you denominate me a tyrant because I would not be in favor of amending the constitution in favor of that one woman?

Mr. KILPATRICK: I would consider if she is a part of humanity and had worked all of these years for that thing, that you would be an absolute tyrant if you refused to give her that right.

Mr. BOWDLE: One further question: How would feminine suffrage in your judgment affect the sweatshop system and the various features of the industrial business in which women are employed?

Mr. KILPATRICK: In all the other states where they now have woman's suffrage — I have not that at hand just this minute to give exact figures, but the laws in regard to the regulation of labor, so far as females and males are concerned, so far as school laws and school conditions are concerned, so far as sanitary conditions and

everything connected with that are concerned, are better than in any of the other states in the Union.

Now, let me ask Mr. Bowdle: Suppose we should pass a law in this state that every man in the state of Ohio by the name of Bowdle should not vote. Then we could say, would the laws in this state be any better if the Bowdles did not vote? But just another question, what would Mr. Bowdle think about that?

Mr. BOWDLE: I can not state it here.

Mr. KILPATRICK: I take it then that the language would be so expressive that perhaps the roof might go off if you would give vent to your feelings.

Mr. ELSON: Do you think that Colorado has a better government than Ohio? Is there a city in Ohio, with all of its misgovernment, that has been so badly governed in the past ten years as Denver?

Mr. KILPATRICK: I could name several municipalities in this state which I think are infinitely worse governed than Denver possibly could be, and I want to say this to you, so far as Denver is concerned, that Denver has produced one man who has done more for the youth of this country and perhaps for the youth of the world, so far as the neglected youth is concerned, than any other man that the United States has produced, and the election of that man was due directly to the women having the right to vote. It was the bosses in that city who endeavored to do away with the good which is there.

Mr. FESS: I would like to ask whether the bad government of Denver is due to the voting of the women? I would like to ask that of Mr. Elson.

Mr. ELSON: I did not know that I was on the carpet. I was wondering why the government of Denver was not better than it is as it has had woman's suffrage for nineteen years. I do not mean for a moment to insinuate that the bad government of Denver is due to woman's suffrage, but to what is it due?

Mr. KILPATRICK: It is a great deal better there with women's suffrage than it would be without.

Mr. ANDERSON: Is it not a fact, Mr. Kilpatrick, that no one knows better than Lindsey the conditions in Denver, and is it not a fact that he is heartily in favor of woman's suffrage because he wants to do away with the conditions they have there?

Mr. KILPATRICK: There is no question about that. There is another point I want to call the attention of the delegates to before I have finished, and that is this: There are some of us who believe that we should have educational and property qualifications so far as the electors are concerned. I am not one of those, however. Let us take for instance in the United States and in this state the proposition from a moral standpoint. Let us take the penal institutions of the United States and of this state as being indicative of the morals. Let us assume that, because I want to say that I think there are a great many men in the penitentiary who ought to be out, and a great many out who ought to be in, but we will assume for argument's sake that it is indicative of the morals of the community. Statistics show — and statistics so far as the inmates of these institutions are concerned are perfectly reliable, because you can get them at first hand — statistics show that in the prisons of the United States there are only five and a half per cent of the inmates who are women. In this state we have sixteen hundred men in our penitentiary and thirty-six wo-

Woman's Suffrage.

men, seven of whom are white. If we assume these premises, and that that is indicative of the morals of the people of the state, who in the name of common sense has a better right to vote from a moral standpoint?

Now I am going to close, and I want to close by reading an extract — it is very brief — from a speech by one of the greatest women the United States has produced. Go back in your pages of history and look at the great women that this cause has produced — Julia Ward Howe, Susan B. Anthony, Florence Nightingale, Frances Willard and many others whom I might mention — great, strong, true, democratic women, women who have done so much for this country in its upbuilding and bringing to the people true democracy. Would that I had the time and you the patience to allow me to enumerate in detail the service of those great souls. In the factories and in the shops and in the offices and in every place in life today, the women have been called out and in every single one of those places woman has shown herself perfectly capable of taking care of the position which she is holding. If she gets the right of suffrage rest assured she will take care of herself under that proposition.

Chicago — that great city — has selected as superintendents of its schools a woman; Cleveland has selected as superintendent of the schools a woman. In all educational, industrial and commercial lines woman today stands the peer and in many instances pre-eminent over man.

Mr. BOWDLE: You see no incongruity in a woman becoming president of the United States or chief justice of the state of Ohio.

Mr. KILPATRICK: Not if a majority of the electors want her to be president of the United States or want her to be on the Ohio supreme court bench, or any other place they want to put her.

Mr. BOWDLE: Then you see no incongruity in Sarah Platt Decker becoming senator of the United States from Colorado.

Mr. KILPATRICK: Not if the constitution permits it and the people of the state wanted her to represent them there.

Mr. BOWDLE: Do you see any incongruity in Sarah Platt Decker being allowed to vote for war when she could not go to war?

Mr. KILPATRICK: She who produces the soldiers is greater than the soldier. Now, with your indulgence I want to finish by reading these words from that great woman, Susan B. Anthony:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America."

It was we, the people; not we, the white male citizens; nor yet we, the male citizens; but we, the whole people, who formed the Union. And we formed it, not to give the blessings of liberty, but to secure them; not to the half of ourselves and the half of our posterity, but to the whole people — women as well as men. And it is a downright mockery to talk to women of their

enjoyment of the blessings of liberty while they are denied the use of the only means of securing them provided by this democratic-republican government — the ballot.

For any state to make sex a qualification that must ever result in the disfranchisement of one entire half of the people is to pass a bill of attainder, or an ex post facto law, and is therefore a violation of the supreme law of the land. By it the blessings of liberty are forever withheld from women and their female posterity. To them this government has no just powers derived from the consent of the governed. To them this government is not a democracy. It is not a republic. Is it an odious aristocracy; a hateful oligarchy of sex; the most hateful aristocracy ever established on the face of the globe. An oligarchy of wealth, where the rich govern the poor, an oligarchy of learning, where the educated govern the ignorant, or even an oligarchy of race, where the Saxon rules the African, might be endured; but this oligarchy of sex, which makes fathers, brothers, husband, sons the oligarchy over the mother and sisters, the wife and daughters of every household — which ordains all men sovereigns, all women subjects, carries dissension, discord and rebellion into every home of the nation.

Webster, Worcester and Bouvier all define a citizen to be a person, in the United States, entitled to vote and hold office.

The only question left to be settled now is: Are women persons? And I hardly believe any of our opponents will have the hardihood to say they are not. Being persons then, women are citizens; and no state has the right to make any law, or to enforce any old law, that will abridge their privileges or immunities. Hence, every discrimination against women in the constitutions and laws of the several states is today null and void, precisely as in every one against negroes.

Mr. BOWDLE: On the score of exact and precise government, saying that we have been voting a hundred and twenty-five years and we are what we are, would not you be in favor of striking out the word "male" in the constitution and inserting the word "female?"

Mr. KILPATRICK: Not by a great deal. The question which you have asked leads me to believe you must be reasoning that whoever seems to be better able to govern ought to govern and that the rest have nothing whatever to say about it, and how you can stand here in this Convention and espouse the cause of the people through the initiative and referendum and then say that one-half of the people ought to have no right to vote, I cannot understand, and when you do that you have not a proper conception of the word "democracy."

There are men and there are women in this state and in the United States too, perhaps, who have cried since the dawn of this country, and in fact you might go back to the dawn of humanity, "This is not the time, this is not an opportune time for democracy. Just wait until tomorrow and then we will give it to you." I will agree that there is an opportune time for all things, but I want to say to every member in this Convention that the opportune

Woman's Suffrage.

time for democracy in this state and in every state in this Union and in the United States is now and here; in other words, the hour cometh and now is when we are going to have democracy. Notwithstanding the fact that the inopportunist may cry this is not the time, this is the time. Democracy is coming.

Mr. STALTER: I would like to have the gentleman explain the meaning of the expression in the constitution of the United States, in the preamble thereof, "Insure domestic tranquillity."

Mr. KILPATRICK: If the men would do what they ought to do under the constitution there would be domestic tranquillity and political tranquillity too.

Mr. STAMM: I want to know whether the speaker said democracy or duomocracy?

Mr. FESS: I would like to ask the gentleman whether domestic tranquillity is the result of a one-sided contract, where all is given to the man and nothing to the woman?

Mr. KILPATRICK: I don't believe it would be.

The delegate from Trumbull here yielded to a motion to recess by the delegate from Cuyahoga [Mr. CROSSER].

The motion was seconded, was put to a vote and carried and the Convention recessed until 1:30 this afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention met pursuant to recess and was called to order by the president, who recognized the delegate from Trumbull [Mr. KILPATRICK].

Mr. KILPATRICK: There are just one or two matters I desire to call your attention to before I take my seat. I shall be very brief.

When Proposal No. 91 was reported out by the committee on Equal Suffrage and Elective Franchise, the minority report was signed by twenty members of that committee; the minority report was signed by one member of the committee. The committee went over the proposal you now find in the book very carefully, and it is the desire of the committee and the desire of those of us who are in favor of this proposal to have it submitted as it appears. If there are any men in this Convention who are opposed to the proposal, or opposed to submission, or opposed to equal suffrage, let them vote "no" on this proposal and vote it down, but those who are in favor of equal suffrage, in favor of the submission of this proposition, vote in the affirmative. What we want in this matter is fairness.

This morning in the preface to my remarks I said I believed every man in this Convention was absolutely fair. I believe that now, and what we ask at your hands, and I ask it most earnestly and respectfully, is to give us this proposal in a fair manner.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: I notice that this No. 91 gives the right of suffrage to every citizen twenty-one years of age, and who shall have been a resident of the state "for one year preceding the election." The present constitution — article V, section 1 — is the same as that except it has the word "next" before the word "preceding." It reads "one year next preceding the election." Was it your intention to leave that out?

Mr. KILPATRICK: That will be amended.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: I have an amendment.

Mr. KILPATRICK: It should be in. It was inadvertently left out.

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: Is there any objection to my offering the amendment now?

Mr. KILPATRICK: No.

The amendment was offered by the delegate from Hamilton [Mr. SMITH] as follows: "Move to amend Substitute Proposal No. 91 as follows: In line 12 insert the word "next" after the word "year."

Mr. SMITH, of Hamilton: I move the adoption of that amendment.

Mr. KILPATRICK: I second it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARSHALL: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: I appear before you this afternoon I believe as the first man who ever stood before a body of this kind in the state of Ohio on the negative side of what is termed the woman suffrage, whether the woman shall have the right to the ballot or not, and while I am here taking this position this afternoon I want to say to the gentlemen and also to the ladies within the sound of my voice, I am not here this afternoon to tear woman down; I am here to hold her up with all the power and might I have. By divine law and natural law I expect to hold woman up today and stand by her in her behalf, where she was placed by the hand that placed her on the grand and noble pedestal of God Almighty's creation. I shall stand for that, though I am alone, first, last and all the time.

The good people of Columbus have opened all the resources they have to give to this Convention all the needed knowledge they can in order that we might frame a constitution that will be better than the old one.

The law libraries have been thrown open, all the libraries have been thrown open and every avenue has been open to us that would lead to the foundations of information so to speak, that we might do our work and do it well. Not during this Convention has there been one brother, and I don't say that in any way of chastisement, but I do say that not since the convening of the Convention has any man referred to God's library.

Mr. DOTY: The member from Hamilton did.

Mr. BOWDLE: No, not yet.

Mr. MARSHALL: I hold in my hand the grandest book that has ever been known in six thousand years, the grandest book that ever will be known if the world stands six thousand years more. It is God's gift to man, God's library to man. It contains sixty-six books. It covers all time from the dawn of creation down the western slope to the end of the world. That library will tell every member of this Convention that lives in the world today or will live hereafter just where he is, his latitude and longitude at all times and under all circumstances, whether it be during the bright sunshine of midday or dead hours of the midnight, whether in sunny fields or on life's tempestuous sea in the middle of the Atlantic ocean — that library will tell you just where you are and how you stand, and all our relations to God's divine or natural laws.

Now there are some things I want to mention in regard to my being here at this time. I called your attention to the fact a few moments ago that perhaps I was the first man that ever stood in this hall and took the position that I am taking today; notwithstanding the

Woman's Suffrage.

state of Ohio is over one hundred years old, I stand here the first man to do it—and, by the way, this is my birthday, the first day of my sixty-fourth year. Sixty-three years ago today down in Coshocton county, on the north hillside, among the red brush, in a little log cabin, I first saw the light. Now I am going to commence my speech on the first day of my sixty-fourth anniversary, from the very first word in the very first book, the first chapter and the first word, that was ever given to man as his guide from a Divine God. I will read to this Convention each day's work and I will comment a little at the close of each day's work:

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

If there is a man in this house who doesn't believe that let him hold up his hand. If there is a lady in this house who doesn't believe that let her hold up her hand.

Mr. DOTY: It is unanimous.

Mr. MARSHALL: "And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

"And God said, Let there be light; and there was light."

Why? Because God said so.

"And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness.

"And God called the light day, and the darkness He called night; and the evening and the morning were the first day."

What I want to impress on every member of this Convention at this time—namely, the beginning of creation—is this fact, that God, in His simplicity, wisdom and power, gave to everything he created its opposite; and He did not stop at giving everything its opposite, but He clothed each and every part with endowments and functions to fill certain places that harmony might prevail in all. Is there any man or any woman here who doesn't believe that?

Mr. DOTY: Unanimous again.

Mr. MARSHALL: When the first day's work of creation was completed we have light, called day, and night, called darkness. Day opposite night, and night opposite day. And there could be nothing more unreasonable or more impossible than for me to conclude that day could take the place of night or night the place of day, without confusing the entire system of creation from beginning to end or from bottom to top. The functions and endowments of day could not be clothed in the functions and endowments of night, neither could the functions and endowments of night be clothed in the functions and endowments of day. First, because they would not fit, and second because the Creator never intended that they should. Do you believe it?

Mr. DOTY: Take a vote on it.

Mr. MARSHALL: Now, again: "And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters: and let it divide the waters from the waters.

"And God made the firmament and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so.

"And God called the firmament Heaven: and the evening and the morning were the second day."

Thus, we find at the conclusion of the second day's work

that a place called Heaven, sacred to the memory of us all (we trust), appeared on the calendar of the Creator's catalogue. Man and woman not having been created as yet, Heaven's opposite was not yet necessary, but came in due time, later on. Do you believe that?

Mr. DOTY: I did not catch that. I may not believe it.

Mr. MARSHALL: "And God said, Let the waters under the Heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so.

"And God called the dry land earth: and the gathering together of the waters called the seas; and God saw that it was good.

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit trees yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so.

"And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind; and God saw that it was good.

"And the evening and the morning were the third day."

Mr. PECK: Did that dry territory ever become wet?

Mr. MARSHALL: I will answer all these questions at the end. Don't interrupt me here.

The third day's work of creation, we might note, was the day on which the vegetable kingdom was flung into existence, clothed with the power and endowments of reproduction—an inanimated life principle little understood and yet unfathomed by the best intellectual powers of the world in six thousand years; and yet the third day's work was not without its opposite—namely, dry land and seas, or land and water, which we could more fully realize (for a short time only) if we were cast into the sea, the home of the whale; certainly we could not long exist because the surrounding circumstances are not congenial to our particular make-up.

"And God said, let there be lights in the firmament of the Heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years.

"And let them be for lights in the firmament of the Heaven to give light upon the earth; and it was so.

"And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; He made the stars also.

"And God set them in the firmament of the Heaven to give light upon the earth.

"And to rule over the day, and over the night and to divide the light from the darkness: And God saw that it was good."

Now, by the way, don't forget that God has given everything its opposite.

"And the evening and the morning were the fourth day."

Thus, we see the fourth day's work of the Creator was spent in the light business.

Some small, some large, some for day and some for night. Some for signs and some for seasons.

We stand in the center of High street, Columbus, Ohio, opposite the state house, at night, we look north and we look south, and we see the effects of man's skill in the light business, and we say, oh, how beautiful! Turning then to the heaven's constellations, we are

Woman's Suffrage.

lost in admiration and wonder of the starry dome of heaven's canopy.

Were I a star in one of those constellations and a jealousy should arise on the part of Mrs. Moon, that she should have equal rights or all the rights of Mr. Sun, it seems to me that I would ponder long and well before I should cast my vote to interrupt the beautiful and harmonious constellation in yonder dome. I certainly would reason with myself that the God, our Creator, knows best. He has created men. He has endowed them, He has given them a place in His divine economy of creation. And it is only wise on my part to not pluck them from their divine place and sphere.

"And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of Heaven.

"And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind; and God saw that it was good.

"And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.

"And the evening and the morning were the fifth day."

We will comment very little on the fifth day's work of creation. Suffice to say that God saw that His fifth day's work was good. He blest the labors of His power of that day and carried out the same principle incorporated in his previous work, namely, endowments to fill certain missions.

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creatures after his kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it was so."

Think for a moment of the wonderful power of the author of our being. He would speak and it was so. Oh, that I could impress upon this intelligent audience tonight the insignificance of man and the greatness of God in His creative splendor and power.

"And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind; and God saw that it was good.

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

"So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created He them.

"And God blessed them, And God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have domination over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

"And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.

"And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat; and it was so.

"And God saw everything that He had made; and be-

hold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day."

We have but little comment to make on the sixth or last day of creation, more than this, that at its conclusion He pronounced it very good. Still carrying out His divine principle of giving to everything its opposite, especially His creation of man and man's opposite, woman.

Thus, we have recorded one of the most wonderful acts of surgical skill known or that will be known in the world's history. This rib, this woman, was the crowning work of God's creation, last but not least. He placed her on the highest pinnacle of the wonderful pedestal of His creation, almost in hand-shaking distance of the angelic host of heaven, and I want to say if John D. Rockefeller at this moment would step into the halls of this Convention and upon some member of this body bestow a billion dollars endowment, it would be as a grain of sand on the seashore compared with the endowment given to woman by the hand of the wise Creator when He bestowed on her the endowments of helpmate, wife and mother.

An undeniable fact which we find before we come to the close of the third chapter of the book of Genesis: No part or particle of all God's creation ever received exalted place or rich endowment that God gave to woman whom he endowed with (I was going to say with the immortal power, and I guess I will) the power of motherhood. Would to God that woman could see herself today as the queen star in the firmament of creation, as her Creator sees her. And why is it that a few women over the state of Ohio have become so masculine in their conceptions of their divine place and sphere in the divine economy of creation that they want to make a fatal leap from the highest pinnacle of the pedestal of creation down to its base, alighting in the seething cauldron of political corruption? And not satisfied with this descent on their own part, they want to take with them in this fatal leap your daughters and my daughters, beautiful daughters, daughters clothed in their white robes of virgin purity, down with them, alighting in the whirlpool of political corruption, and thus immersing their white robes of purity in the indelible stench of the political world, which time can never erase.

And yet they come to me asking my assistance in this, their fatal leap.

Should I conclude to cast my vote in behalf of this fatal leap, at that moment I should feel that heaven's recording angel had dotted down against me the equal of the—if not the—unpardonable sin. And again I would feel that I had committed treason against God and the government of High Heaven by my revolt against divine and natural law. And again, I should fully realize that I was casting my vote to blot out three of the most sacred words known in the world's vocabulary of six thousand years, namely, mother, home and heaven.

I ask you, gentlemen of this Convention, to blot out for one moment the three words above mentioned, and I will again ask you what you have left? Whether or not you may look on this vital question as I do, I want to assure you of one thing, and that is that you and I will never know to the fullest extent the danger of trampling under foot divine and natural law, but let me assure you of one thing, that to every departure from divine or

Woman's Suffrage.

natural law there is a penalty attached, the result being disorganization, confusion and Babelism.

Mr. DOTY: What is that word — "babyism"?

Mr. MARSHALL: No; "Babelism," not babyism."

Mr. LAMPSON: We did not catch that. Will the gentleman repeat it?

The speaker repeated the last two sentences.

Mr. MARSHALL: At this time I want to read to this Convention a communication sent to me signed Frances H. Ensign, president of the Ohio W. C. T. U. Of course this article is human, from a human standpoint, and at its conclusion I will read from a biblical or divine standpoint, thus having woman—flesh and blood—on one side, and God—divinity and revelation—on the other, giving every member of this Convention the privilege of standing for a farce—whims and delusions on the one hand— or standing for God—divinity and revelation on the other. So, we read as follows:

We maintain that the woman movement is not solely for the interest of womanhood, but equally in behalf of manhood and childhood. The women asking for the ballot are opposed to all sex antagonism or sex dominance by either men or women, and far from their thought is it that there should result any rivalry or competing claims between the sexes, the complementary halves of humanity.

"The woman's cause is man's; they rise or sink together, dwarfed or God-like, bond or free."

Twentieth century women are actuated by a very real desire to render personal service to the state by helping to solve some of the political problems and make our democracy more efficient that our brother was talking about this morning.

The mothers of men need the development this expansion of woman's thought and work would give. Because women are vitally interested in the progress and improvement of the race, in social welfare and civic betterment, and, moreover, upon the faithful performance of political duties by men and women, depend the safety, sanctity and solidarity of the home—woman's particular realm—for these, and many other reasons of justice and highest expediency, we are asking you to submit to the qualified electors of the state the question of woman's enfranchisement.

Realizing as keenly as you must that the political and moral status of a people depend upon the place its women occupy, we are confident you will be eminently fair and just to your own mothers, wives and sisters, at present belonging to an enslaved class, and vote to grant the civil rights and privileges of American citizenship.

Yours for Humanity,

FRANCES H. ENSIGN.

Now that is the human side, the whim side. Now I am going to read from the divine side, and I want every man of you to weigh the human side with the divine side, and if you think God is greater than man, if God is God, just step right over on the side of God and on the side of natural law.

A few Bible quotations of women's place and sphere in the divine economy of creation:

And the Lord God said: It is not good that man should be alone. I will make him an helpmeet for him. (Gen. 2: 18.)

And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed. (Gen. 2:25.)

An Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living. (Gen. 3: 20.)

Unto the woman he said: I will greatly multiply thy conception. In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be thy husband and he shall rule over thee. (Gen. 3: 16.)

Mr. DOTY: But it doesn't work that way.

Mr. MARSHALL: But that is God's way.

Mr. DOTY: Well it doesn't work that way.

Mr. MARSHALL: Now please keep quiet.

The above quotations are only a very few of the many divine declarations made in regard to woman's place in the Old Testament scriptures. But perhaps four thousand years after the quotations mentioned above, and under a new gospel dispensation, woman's place and sphere are mentioned again with very little material change, as follows:

Let your women keep silent in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak. But they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law; and if they will learn anything—let them ask their husbands at home, for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church. Paul-1 Cor. 14:34-35.)

But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ. And the head of every woman is the man. The head of Christ is God. (1st Cor. 11:3.)

Do you believe it? Is there a delegate in this Convention who doesn't believe it? If there is hold up your hand.

Mr. DOTY: Unanimous again.

Mr. MARSHALL:

See then, that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time. Because the days are evil.

Do you know that we are living in evil days?

Mr. DOTY: No; these are the best days you ever saw.

Mr. MARSHALL:

Wherefore be ye not unwise but understanding what the will of the Lord is and be not drunk with wine wherein is excess, but be filled with the spirit, speaking to yourselves, psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord, giving thanks, always, for all things unto God, and the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God. Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church;

Woman's Suffrage.

and he is the Savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their husbands in everything. (Eph. 5: 15-24.)

Wives submit yourselves unto your husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. (Col. 3:18.)

But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine, that the aged man be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity in patience. The aged women, that they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discrete, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God is not blasphemed. (Titus 2: 4-5.)

Again let us note in the Savior's calling and commissioning of the apostles to go into all the world and preach the gospel, that they were all men.

And again: When he commissioned or appointed other seventy and sent them two and two before His face into every city and place whither He, Himself, would come, that there was none of the fair sex included.

And we might go farther and say, that among God's special calls; such as Noah, Jacob, Moses, Gideon, Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, and Jonah, there was not a woman incorporated in those special calls, proving without a doubt that God had a higher and nobler sphere and purpose for woman to fill.

Mr. DOTY: I have just received word that a large number of the inmates of one of our institutions for the blind are outside and there is no room in the galleries and they are anxious to come in and hear this speaker and others. I therefore suggest, if there is no objection, that we allow them to come into the lobby.

Mr. HOSKINS: What institution is that? Did I understand it was the institution for the insane?

Mr. DOTY: I said "blind."

Mr. LAMPSON: I understood you to say "deaf and dumb."

Mr. MARSHALL: Now, gentlemen of the Convention, I have no comment to make either on the divine or human side of what I just read, leaving it entirely with you for your own decision, and will now pass on to make a few remarks on the subject of character, manhood and womanhood.

Mr. BOWDLE: I observe that you have quoted several times from St. Paul. Do you not know that the suffrage movement repudiates St. Paul?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes; I knew that and I know that a great many people would throw the Bible into the sea and continue on the road and go down, down, down to — you know where.

And I will say first that character, manhood and womanhood are in some respects like color, their origin or source having its foundation laid in the transmission of life. Don't forget that no man or woman need ever to pin a white ribbon on the breast and think for a moment that by so doing he or she can go out into the world and change the color of the little babe that was born black. If they do, they are laboring under a grand delusion.

One more thought on this part of the subject, and we

will pass on. I know a man who, a couple of years ago, bought from his neighbor eight or ten little lambs known among farmers as the tail-ends. They were bought for fifty cents per head. The smallest and most trifling one of all (to all appearances) belonged to the masculine side of the house. Those little lambs were wintered. When the fleece, in May, was shorn off the little masculine chap and was put on the scales, it tipped the beam at twenty-one pounds. The foundation or base of that twenty-one pounds of wool was laid in the transmission of life. And I want to say, as every farmer and perhaps every other member of this Convention well knows, that this foundation was not laid by either Cotswold or Leicester. So, with this remark, that like begets like, I pass on to make a few remarks on the subject of conservation, a subject so intimately connected with the subject now under discussion.

I am not here to discuss under this head at this time the conservation of our forest, which has been ruthlessly and wastefully destroyed in the last fifty years and which we begin to feel the effects of more and more keenly every year; nor am I here to speak of the conservation of the soil and the life-giving principles of the farms of the state of Ohio, a vast portion of which life-saving principles today lie in the Gulf of Mexico, never to return; but I am here at this time to say something about the conservation of those life-giving principles given to woman by her Creator, to be conserved and preserved by her and used by her in the transmission, conception and betterment of unborn generations while yet in their embryonic state.

With these powers of life, both physical and mental, shattered and worn out by the parasitical sap-sucker of the political world, how, oh, how, I ask you, gentlemen of this Convention, will we ever hope to keep future generations from entering the stream that leads down, down the hillside to the deeper waters of degeneration? Let me ask the question: Will quietude of life, will beautiful scenery, will mind over matter, have anything to do with shaping the destiny of future generations, either for weal or for woe? With the everlasting worry, hurry and the increased pace in which the world is going today, with increasing paralysis, heart failure, apoplexy, nervous prostration, etc., do we expect to arrest the progress and ravages of those diseases by sending our daughters, wives and mothers out into the excitement and revelry of the political world? If we do, let us go home, throw down our fences, turn our flocks to the mercy of the dogs, and do all of this in the hope of the betterment of future progeny.

Now, we pass to notice briefly the result of conserving, or the conservation of, the vital forces in the vegetable kingdom. I believe, if I mistake not, that there is a law on the statute books of Ohio compelling horticulturists to spray their fruit trees. We ask, for what? And the answer comes, to kill the germ or parasite that may sap the flow of life-giving fluid from the bud, the blossom, yes, and even the prospective fruit while yet in its embryonic state, that it may have that normal and natural flow of nature's life-giving fluid in order that perfection may be reached in the full growth and ripening of the fruit that is to follow.

We can not have beautiful fruit with trees laden with parasites. We cannot expect coming generations

Woman's Suffrage.

to improve physically and mentally by weighting or burdening mothers down by extra burdens.

I care not what those burdens be—and they are legion, and more coming—they will sap the life.

Abnormal conditions follow, and the result is degeneration.

Now, gentlemen of the Convention, we all admit that there are a great many wrongs in this world, all of which have their origin in sin. And I cannot see for my part how extending the right of suffrage to women would help in any way, shape or form to eradicate any evil or evils now existing in the catalogue of wrong, but on the other hand, I can see in it many, many ways that would contribute to the multiplicity of crime and wrong. And if I could give no other reason, this one fact covers it all, because it would be a departure from God's divine and natural law.

Will you allow me to briefly offer a suggestion which I think would do more good for the betterment of the world's condition than any other I can think of?

Divide, if you please, the world or people into three divisions, the first to be known as state; its functions of government and power invested in the legislative, executive, and judicial; its functions so operated and controlled as to give equal rights to all and special privilege to none; its sphere of operations to be entirely relative to the temporal and physical wants of man.

The second division of the human family I would denominate as the church or Kingdom of God, guided, directed and controlled at all times and under all circumstances by Divine revelation; its head to be Christ; its inhabitants Christians; its ambassadors, pastors, who should feed the flock, not on temporal, not on carnal, but on spiritual things, not pertaining to this life, but to that which is to come. Commencing at regeneration or new birth, feeding the new-born babes in the kingdom or church of Christ on the sincere milk of the world that they may grow thereby; thus having in the second department the pastor or ambassador, the word and the flock.

The third and last division, but in no wise the least, would be the home, the throne of woman, whose supreme functions should be helpmeet, wife and mother. With all the powers of mind and body bequeathed to her by the power and hand of a wise Creator, used and utilized in those three divine appointments, namely, helpmeet, wife and mother, for the purpose of making home the most beautiful place to be and the most sacred place in the memory of our affections, connected with the temporal affairs of earth. In that home, where meditation should be on these questions: How best can I be a helpmeet? How best can I be a wife? How best can I be a mother? With her life spent on this trio of God-given spheres in which He intended her to operate, we have not the slightest reason to doubt that her life work, thus spent, would thus elevate all concerned now living and contribute to the betterment and elevation of nations yet unborn.

No word has ever been dropped on the bosom of life's tempestuous sea in the six thousand years of the world's history, or will he in the six thousand years to come, that will vibrate and re-vibrate without any diminution or loss of power or sweetness, as the word home. Home, sweet home!

And now of every one I ask, and may the solemn

question bound, where will you be, how will you vote when the day to cast your ballot comes around?

Mr. DOTY: If you mean me, I will vote "yes."

Mr. MARSHALL: As I said before, the highest place and richest endowment given in all the work of creation was given to woman when she was crowned and endowed with powers of motherhood. The next highest gift that ever came from God to man was the commission, when near two thousand years ago he led His disciples out as far as Bethany, lifted up His hands and blessed them and said, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

Now, gentlemen of the Convention, let me say by way of conclusion, for perhaps you are becoming somewhat weary—

DELEGATES: No, no; go on, go on.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have tried in my weakness to point out woman's place and sphere as directed by Divine wisdom, as given to us by Divine revelation. And my aim has not been to throw her down, but to keep her high up, where she belongs.

And now, with the Bible in one hand, natural law in the other, and with your daughters and my daughters, I will ascend the rugged cliffs of this magnificent pedestal of creation, and when I have reached its summit, in the presence of that God who is unchanging—the same yesterday, today and forever—I shall there in His presence plead in behalf of His truth, in behalf of the conservation and preservation of the white robe of virgin purity belonging to your daughters and to my daughters, ever holding them up to the highest and noblest place in all His work of creative power, namely, helpmeet, wife and mother, which are only sisters to mother, home and heaven.

Submitting these few remarks by way of arguments against the new, inhuman and ungodly principle of woman suffrage, I submit the same to you for your consideration, and also submit myself to the shot and shell of this Convention, provided you may have anything to say.

The chair here recognized the delegate from Montgomery [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES: I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. DOTY: Mr. Marshall, you have forgotten your flowers and your Bible.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, and I forgot something that I intended to say.

Mr. DOTY: I ask unanimous consent for the gentleman to continue his remarks. He forgot something.

Mr. MARSHALL: It was my pleasure during the noon hour with a couple of other friends in the Convention to take a walk down Broad and across State for recreation. We passed a block down on the east side somewhere and I looked in and saw they had some beautiful flowers. That flower is the product of Divine power. It is generated and produced by natural law with Divinity behind it. In the principle of wisdom, economy and power that brought that into existence to fill a certain place, there is what we call a normal condition, a normal flow of sap. It makes those beautiful things that I hold in my hand, and whenever the condition that produces that beautiful flower is by a natural law, we

Woman's Suffrage.

get the normal flower. I mean by normal, right. Whenever those conditions are just right we have the perfection that God, our Creator, manifested to us in that beautiful flower. If perchance there is a little bug or parasite — we will call it a parasite — during the formation of the bud gets on the flower, that parasite with its bill saps some of the natural flow away that makes the beautiful flower and the flower will be dwarfed exactly in proportion to the sapping of the life-giving and beautifying principle that was placed in it by the hand of the Creator. Is there a man in this Convention who dares to deny that, or deny the statement of the natural principle?

DELEGATES: No, no, no, no!

Mr. DOTY: It is unanimous again. You have unanimous votes all the time today.

Mr. MARSHALL: That flower can be compared with the help-meet, wife and mother. She has a certain sphere to build in order to beautify coming generations. Anything that saps or takes away or destroys any of her vital power, will lead to the degeneracy of coming generations, just as we see degeneracy in the flower when the life-giving principle is taken away by a parasite. I could take a half an hour longer along this line, but I will desist.

The PRESIDENT: The secretary will read the amendment offered by the delegate from Montgomery [Mr. STOKES].

The secretary read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "to-wit" in line 9 and insert the following:

SECTION 2. That the general assembly shall, at its next regular session, provide by law for holding an election by the female citizens of the state, having the qualifications of male electors, and at which election there shall be submitted to such female citizens the following proposal:

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

SECTION 3. At such election a separate ballot shall be in the following form:

EQUAL SUFFRAGE.

	For Female Suffrage
	Against Female Suffrage.

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

SECTION 4. If the votes cast at such election by such female citizens in favor of "Female Suffrage" shall exceed the votes cast at such election by such female citizens against "Female Suffrage" then the clause herein above submit-

ted shall become a part of article V, of the constitution of this state.

SECTION 5. The aforesaid proposal is by the Convention submitted to the electors of Ohio and shall be placed upon the ballots, independently of the submission of any revisions, alterations or other amendments submitted at the election when any such other revision, alterations or amendments shall be submitted for their approval or rejection; and if the votes for said proposal exceed those against same upon the holding of an election by such female citizens above provided for, such provision shall become a part of article V, of the constitution of this state.

Mr. DOTY: I move to lay this amendment on the table.

The motion was carried.

Mr. WOODS: I offer an amendment.

The amendment was read by the secretary as follows:

In section 2 in the form of the ballot strike out both word "equal" and insert "woman's."

In lines 22 and 24, strike out the word "equal" and insert the word "woman's."

Mr. WOODS: This just changes the form of the ballot and instead of reading for equal suffrage it makes it for woman's suffrage.

Mr. DOTY: There is another phase and another question involved besides woman's suffrage and that is taking out the word "white." Therefore if you label the whole thing woman's suffrage, you are not labelling it what it is. The words "equal suffrage" indicates the whole scope of the subject.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: I consider that immaterial entirely, because the provision in our constitution has been nullified long ago by the federal constitution and it does not avail any longer.

Mr. WATSON: I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. WOODS: I don't want to take any time on the matter. The amendment has been submitted to Mr. Kilpatrick and he understands it. It is just a question of applying to woman's suffrage. The color question is really out anyhow, and if we label it "woman's suffrage" nobody can make any mistake on election day. Everybody will understand it.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the adoption of the amendment by the delegate from Medina [Mr. Woods].

The motion was carried.

Mr. READ: I do not intend to speak very long or deliver any logical discourse upon this subject. I only rise to express what are the sentiments of the particular section of the state from which I come upon this question, especially Summit county.

I have received in the last few days a petition signed by eighteen hundred electors of the county asking that I use my voice, my influence and my vote to have this question of woman's suffrage submitted to the electors of the state as a separate proposition when this constitution is voted on.

Not very long ago I was in sympathy with an amendment that had been offered and I think wisely laid upon

Woman's Suffrage.

the table—that is, of submitting the question to the women themselves to decide. It seems it would be fair and just that if a majority of the women wanted to vote and would find some way of proving it, they should all have the privilege of the ballot, and if a majority did not want to vote, it would not be right to impose the extra duties of citizenship upon them. That was a thought that had hold of my mind for a while, but after more mature deliberation on the subject, and especially after talking to some of the women about it, I changed my mind I found they had better ideas than I did about the question.

In the first place it would be hardly possible to get a correct expression of the women on that question in that way. In the second place, if we did, it would not be authoritative. Therefore, it would simply be getting an expression of some of the women in regard to that matter. We know that a number of women do not want the ballot, and, as said by the first speaker from Trumbull [Mr. KILPATRICK] if there is one woman in the state of Ohio who wants the ballot, we have no right to deny it to her. This is one of the cases in which the rights of the minority rise to the same magnitude as the rights of the majority, because it is a question of human right.

Again it is said that the women don't vote now when they have the opportunity. That is true to a certain extent. In the state of Ohio women are now permitted to vote upon school questions and some of them don't vote. And if I were a woman I wouldn't vote either. They have an inherent and natural right, a right that was coeval with self-government and coexistent with every right of American citizenship, and we permit them to exercise part of the right but not all. I would not exercise part of a right either. I would feel humiliated in doing it. I don't blame them for not voting for members of school boards. Their vote on school matters is less needed than on any other. You talk about woman's influence being so great she don't need to vote because she has more influence without it—there is no place where she has more influence than in our schools; in fact, the schools have been handed over to her and she has practically everything to do with our schools. Therefore, she doesn't need the ballot there. Where she needs the ballot is in dealing with the social and national problems of the world, and this is a national and a human right. We are not granting her any right. We are simply laying down the bars that she may enter into the political arena and there exercise those rights. We are simply granting her the privilege which we have no right to deny her.

Now, whether or not it would be of benefit to the country at large for women to vote, can not be a mooted question. Is she not of value in the home? Is not her judgment and her intuition, which supplements the reason and experience of her husband, valuable in raising the family and conducting domestic affairs? And would not she in the same way, in that larger field, be of some value to him? We find that where the boys and girls in our schools have the same advantages, the average intelligence and quickness and alertness and natural development of the girls fully equal that of the boys, and we also find that the intelligence of the women, where they have the same opportunities that men

have in life, equals that of the men. It may be of a little different kind; he may have stronger reasoning faculties, but she will have the stronger intuition, and sometimes intuition leads us in the right path better than reason. But there can be no question about her mentality or ability to vote on these questions.

Now, I do not want to take longer on this question because I know—I feel at least—that nearly every person in this Convention is in favor of giving women this privilege. The question that confronts us now is not granting the franchise to women, but whether we will give to the electors of the state the right to decide the question. We do not need to discuss the merits of this question. It is only a question of whether we will give the electors of the state a thorough opportunity to decide whether women shall have the right of suffrage or not. That is the question before us. And I think when it comes to a vote it will be agreed almost unanimously. I can not see how any man could refuse to give the people an opportunity to decide on this question. How any one who believes in the initiative and referendum, and who believes in self-government, can deny them the right, recognizing, too, that it is a natural right, I can not see.

Mr. BOWDLE: Do you believe it is a natural right for a woman to be—for illustration—president of the United States or chief justice of the supreme court of Ohio?

Mr. READ: A natural right?

Mr. BOWDLE: Yes.

Mr. READ: Is it a natural right for man?

Mr. BOWDLE: I want you to answer the question.

Mr. READ: If it is a natural right for a man, it is a natural right for a woman. Was it a natural right for Queen Victoria to be queen of England?

Mr. BOWDLE: That is an answer. Would you consent to try a case before a jury or judge who was ruled by intuition?

Mr. READ: I don't know but that I would. Intuition sometimes is a good deal better than the reasoning of some men.

Mr. PECK: Mr. President and gentlemen: I think you all know it is not my custom to speak long, but I feel so profoundly on this question that I can not permit it to pass without saying a few words.

It is a question of great importance. It is a question that is far reaching and it is one that I believe the people of Ohio are now ripe to decide. It has come upon us slowly and gradually. It was laughed at a great deal. For years and years it was a joke—woman's suffrage—and it was treated in that way by some people, but that day is passed. Woman's suffrage is pressing everywhere. It has been adopted in six states in this Union. It has within the past few months been adopted in the kingdom of Sweden and women there have been endowed with the full right of suffrage; they vote for members of parliament and everything else to be elected. If you have read in the papers of the fight that is going on in England, you know the women are fighting for suffrage there and that it is a live question there. And the women will get the suffrage. Nobody doubts that if it comes to a vote in parliament, they will get it. In fact, for the last year a majority of parliament has been in favor of woman's suffrage whenever it comes to a vote,

Woman's Suffrage.

but the ministry, for political reasons, won't let it come to a vote. That is why the women are raising such a ruction about it, because the ministry won't let parliament vote. That is what is making all that fighting in London. It is not so much a question of woman's suffrage as the refusal of the existing ministry to permit the subject to be voted on, for they know the moment they permit it to be voted on the women will be endowed with suffrage. They have it now in municipal, school and local affairs. In Ireland every woman has a right to vote for everything but members of parliament. The Irish woman who comes over to this country with a shawl over her head left behind her greater political rights than she has here, even after she is naturalized.

This is a burning question, a live question, and we men delegated by the state of Ohio to consider constitutional questions must consider it seriously and pass upon it in a sober way. The women of Ohio ought to have the right of suffrage in my judgment. Before I get to the merits of the question I want to call attention to the form in which it comes before you. It comes before you now on a proposition to submit it to a vote of the people. Could anything be fairer? Can anybody object to that? I put it to my friend from Hamilton county, can he object to it being put to the people?

I do not think any reasonable argument can be made against the submission of it. I have never heard anything like an argument against the proposition.

Mr. TALLMAN: Are not the same women who ask that the woman's suffrage question be submitted to a vote of the people the women who opposed the submission of the license question to the people of Ohio, and haven't you got a number of those petitions?

Mr. PECK: I don't know anything about the women being opposed to the license question and I don't know anything about those petitions.

Mr. TALLMAN: They came together.

Mr. PECK: If you know anything about this matter of license at all, you know that I was for license, first, last and always, and the two questions ought not to be mixed, for they have nothing to do with each other.

Mr. TALLMAN: Those women were opposed to the license question being submitted.

Mr. PECK: I know some people have been trying to mix them up and trying to gain some support for their side by claiming that the women were against the other proposition.

Mr. ANDERSON: Would it be any more inconsistent for a delegate to vote for a separate submission to the people of the question of license or no license, and refuse to vote for a separate submission than to have the women take the position stated by Mr. Tallman?

Mr. PECK: I don't catch your question.

Mr. ANDERSON: Can any delegate be consistent in saying he opposes the submission of the woman's suffrage question to the people of Ohio, and yet vote to have the license question submitted?

Mr. PECK: I don't think any delegate here who has confidence in the people, who believes in government by the people, can object to submitting any question of great and vital importance to a vote of the people. If we believe in the referendum why not submit? Where is your referendum?

Mr. BOWDLE: I would like to ask the gentleman a question?

The PRESIDENT: Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PECK: I do. Fire away.

Mr. BOWDLE: I will not fire. Can you not conceive it as possible for a person to be opposed to feminine suffrage and still vote to submit this question to the electors?

Mr. PECK: Yes; I can. I think this would be an act of fairness. I think that men ought to do that.

Mr. BOWDLE: Do you know as you stand here that that is not my position?

Mr. PECK: I don't know your position. I don't suppose I will until you vote, but I hope you will vote for the submission of this question and that is all we ask, the right to have it voted upon by the people. Now, will you let us have a referendum on that subject or not?

Mr. KING: Speaking on the subject of fairness, I will ask you if it would not be fairer to submit the question of woman's suffrage alone, rather than mix it up with the suffrage of a large number of other people in order to draw support?

Mr. PECK: I don't think there is anything in that. Do you mean this "white" business?

Mr. KING: There are forty thousand colored voters.

Mr. PECK: Their right to vote is absolutely secured by the constitution of the United States, and that is the most difficult document on earth to amend.

Mr. KING: Many of them want that stricken out.

Mr. PECK: Possibly they do. If I were one of them I would, but I do not think that cuts any figure. That word "white" stood in the constitution right next to the word "male" and it ought to go out. We don't want to retain in the constitution of Ohio anything that is in conflict with the constitution of the United States. Everybody wants it out and the people who drafted this amendment thought it was proper to be put that way. I don't think there was any expectation of drawing any votes. What we want is a clear referendum on this and I think it will be clearly put to the people by this proposal. It is as plain as could be. It is not full of all sorts of verbiage and restrictions like the liquor amendment. It is perfectly straightforward. It means just one thing, the enfranchisement of women, and I have a profound belief that the people of Ohio are going to vote for it, but that is not here nor there. Our business is to say whether they are to have an opportunity to vote for it, and I have not yet heard any argument that opposes the proposition — that they ought not to have an opportunity to vote for it.

On the general subject of woman's suffrage I have little to say. I have been thinking for a good while on it and I have come to first one conclusion and then another, always tending in the direction that we need the women in our American political life. I think the American political life has long suffered for the want of many things that women would bring to it. You know that there are many things that women could do that men can not do, as well as there are other things that men can do that women cannot do well. So they supplement each other, and so they should supplement each other in politics as in other affairs of life. We need the quickness of perception and the moral force of women in the political life of this country.

Woman's Suffrage.

Gentlemen, if you want clean streets in your cities let the women vote. If you want your streets and highways kept in repair and your cities kept sanitary, let the women vote. If you want your school houses kept in order and made sanitary, let the women vote. They will keep them in order. If you want your schools run right and your school teachers kept up to the mark, let the women vote. They will take care of that. If you want playgrounds for the children, let the women look after it by their votes.

These are some of the things women will do and there are many others that I might enumerate. It is all in one direction. There is nothing but what favors the same conclusion. Take in the matter of civics — anything that pertains to the life of the community, especially the moral welfare of the whole community. I am speaking of this with reference to the whole community; I am not speaking of it as a matter of benefit to the women. I am speaking for the benefit of the men as much as the women. Men need the women in politics just as much as the women need to vote. We want them. We need their assistance. I know that the women have suffered a good deal of wrong for the want of the voting power. I have seen year after year in Hamilton county women teachers doing the same work that men do for exactly one-half of the compensation. Do you think that would have stood long if the women had a right to vote?

Mr. TALLMAN: Is there any law to uphold that?

Mr. PECK: No, sir; it is the regulation of your elective body, and do you suppose if the women had the right to vote that would have continued?

There are a great many injustices in that line. The hours of labor and the wages of women are wrong. There are many ways in which they have been abused in private life as well as in public life, and private employment as well as public employment. These are things for which women especially need the suffrage. But I am not speaking of that so much as I am speaking of the man. Now I am going to give you the real fundamental reason why I am for woman's suffrage. We want the moral force of the women of Ohio in Ohio politics. Women habitually live on higher moral planes than men. The statistics referred to this morning by Mr. Kilpatrick show that and everybody knows it. There are a few exceptions to that, but as a rule women habitually live on a higher moral plane than men, and we want that moral force in our politics as it is in our social life. We want it to help cleanse our political life. Brethren, there is no reform on earth like an individual reform. You may reform forms of government, and change forms of government and switch them about, and have this sort of a board and that sort of a board, and this sort of an assembly and that sort of an assembly, and this sort of a court and that sort a court, but there is no reform that goes to the bottom of things like individual reform, which makes a man better and purer and more honorable, and that is the kind of reform that the introduction of women in the politics will forward, and that is the fundamental reason why I am in favor of woman's suffrage.

Do you want to drive the political grafter out of public life? Do you want to get rid of those vermin? If you do, let the women vote. The testimony is from

Washington and Colorado that the introduction of woman's suffrage has had a wonderful effect in those matters. The vermin are seeking their holes rapidly.

Mr. BOWDLE: When I hear a word that reflects on man as man I become naturally agitated, and when you say that the women are more moral than men do you use it in a restricted sense or in a general sense?

Mr. PECK: No, sir; in the broad sense. I said there were some exceptions.

Mr. BOWDLE: Do you think the women in the contractual sense are more careful and precise about keeping their pecuniary obligations than men?

Mr. PECK: Now you put your finger on the very exception that I was thinking about. From long generations of mingling in business affairs, there has grown up in man a sense of contractual relations that is stronger than the same sense in women. I don't think women keep their promises as well as men. That is the only respect in which women are inferior to men, and it has grown out of the fact that the men have been doing the business of the world and the women have had nothing to do with it. In every other respect the woman is morally man's superior and we want the moral force of the women in Ohio, in the politics of Ohio, and that is the reason why I for one will vote for woman's suffrage if ever submitted, and I submit to you as honorable men you can not refuse the state the right to vote for woman's suffrage.

Mr. BOWDLE: You and I come from the same German county. Believing as we do in representative government, do you think your vote to submit the question fairly represents the condition of the minds of our constituents?

Mr. PECK: My dear boy, I do not admit that Hamilton county is a German county. Hamilton county is an American county. Hamilton county has a great many people of German birth and descent in it. Perhaps one-third of its population is of that origin and the other two-thirds are mixed English, Scotch and Irish, and they have a good deal to say about what goes on in Hamilton county. My impression is that when this matter comes to be submitted woman's suffrage will carry in Hamilton county as well as in the other counties in the state. There is a great deal of talk and some of our fellow delegates are very much afraid that women in certain respects may not vote just exactly right. But see what happened in Los Angeles! The women divided on some questions. They divided just as the men did and they will be divided at the caucuses and at the conventions and at the polls, and that is where we want them.

Mr. WATSON: I move that speeches hereafter be limited to ten minutes and that we have a vote on this question at four o'clock.

The motion was carried.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: Gentlemen of the Convention: I had no intention of making a speech on woman's suffrage until this afternoon when my friend Judge Peck thought I was going to make a speech against it, and he was so disappointed that I want to make this speech in payment for the feelings engendered by that fact.

I am of the opinion that this is a question for submission to the people, the right of the women to vote. I

Woman's Suffrage.

think that the women of this country and every other country are responsible for the prosperity and moral uplift and material well-being of every nation to a larger extent than the men are. And while I expressed a doubt about the propriety of women voting, in the interest of maintaining the high position that women hold, I do maintain, as a matter of right, if they want to vote they should have a right to vote, and that you should give the people a chance to say whether they should vote or not. If we do not furnish them the referendum in this matter we are not doing our honest duty. I believe that a man who will vote against it this afternoon will be doing something with a purpose sinister that is no better to himself than to anybody else. There is not any reason under the sun why the matter should not be submitted to the electorate of this state. All of this discussion is entirely unnecessary. There is no reason why there should be two sides to it. They have a right to be heard, they have a right to vote and they have a right to have this matter submitted to the people, and if the people who have the franchise vote it down, then they have had their day. There is no reason under the sun why it should not be done. Why anybody should argue on the other side is an enigma to me. I believe we ought to take this vote and be done with it and get rid of this farce of opposing a thing which is absolutely a measure of right.

Mr. EVANS: As you are aware, I do not desire to tire you and I shall speak strictly on the subject.

I regard this subject as by far the most important that will come before the Convention, and yet for some reason which I cannot explain, and I doubt if any member of the Convention can explain, it has not aroused the interest which was taken in the liquor question.

We are going in the proposal under consideration to make citizens and the question is who shall be the foundation of the structure we are going to build? The prosperity of this state depends upon who are its citizens. Who have the power to create the legislature, and who have the power to create our officers, and who shall govern us? That is a great function, and it is the most important subject we have before us. I say it was the most unfortunate thing that ever happened in this country when the right of suffrage was not fixed in the federal constitution as it ought to have been done, and it ought to have been in every state in the Union.

I believe the United States has the power to determine national suffrage and I am of the opinion they have it under the constitution, and I consider they have it by virtue of those powers that every nation has, independent of any written constitution, and I say to you, gentlemen of the Convention, if there should be another civil war in this country it will be about the right of suffrage. Members of the present age of Mr. Halenkamp may have to take care of that matter. The "Council of the Ancients," sitting in the front row here, will not have anything to do with it. But the states today have the power to determine their suffrage. I admit that the members are all honorable men; as Mark Anthony said of Brutus and his fellow conspirators, they are all "honorable men". I have not felt that we have always done our duty. What I want is to make man suffrage decent and whenever that is done then I am in favor of woman's suffrage, and not until then. I say I want to see

some qualification touching man's suffrage. I want to know if we have progressed any in this country.

Mr. BROWN of Highland: May I ask a question?

Mr. EVANS: I would prefer not to be interrupted until the end of my speech and then I will answer the question.

This state was organized in 1802, and until 1839 we had no free schools in Ohio. All the children who went to school prior to 1839 had their parents and guardians or friends pay their tuition. In 1839 we adopted the system of free schools, thirty-seven years after the organization of the state, and then we didn't compel the attendance of children in the schools. Notwithstanding we had the schools and paid for them it was not until 1892 that we made attendance on school compulsory. Now we are being civilized gradually. If we had any competent system of statistics in this state, which we have not, and which I would like to see provided, I could say from this platform right now what Ohio has spent for our public school system since it was organized in 1839, and I would be glad to name the sum, for it is millions and millions of dollars. I say let us have an educational qualification. Let us say that a man must read and write English, must have character qualifications and a property qualification. Now don't misunderstand me on that form. I don't mean actual property, personal property or real estate, but I say this—let us have a minimum value placed on a man and a woman twenty-one years of age. What economic value should it be? I say at least \$100, and I say if a man or woman comes of age and is not worth to the community at least \$100 he or she ought not to vote.

Statistics will demonstrate what I affirm. Proposal No. 81 as introduced expresses my views. The proposal under consideration does not go far enough. It is the intention of this body, after adopting the fifteen articles that are in the proposed constitution, to submit each one of them separately to the public vote, yea and nay, at a special election and let the electors vote on each article by itself. I have no objection to that, and I am of the opinion that it ought to be done. I think that the constitution we make here ought to be submitted to the people at a separate election and it ought to be submitted both as a whole and by separate articles, and that each of the electors should be required to vote on the constitution as a whole. I say if that is to be the policy of the Convention, I approve it, but as the matter now stands before this body I am not in favor of submitting these proposals under consideration to the people. I want to know what we are going to do and how we are going to do it.

Mr. DOTY: Is it your understanding that this particular proposal we are talking about in any event is to be submitted separately?

Mr. EVANS: I don't know why it should be. I am in favor of submitting the constitution without any separate question whatever, or else, if that is not agreeable to this Convention, I am in favor of submitting each one separately.

Mr. DOTY: If this question is submitted separately it meets your ideas?

Mr. EVANS: No; I am opposed to giving women suffrage until we make men's suffrage decent.

Woman's Suffrage.

Mr. LAMPSON: Why not make them both decent together?

Mr. EVANS: You have no such requirement. This proposition before the Convention is simply a question of perpetuating the rule of political bosses. I say if you do not eliminate all bad men in the electorate of the class which Judge Blair has discovered in Adams county, and a large body of which is in every state, we are not ready to have the women vote. I say we should eliminate the sick and diseased portion of the body politic. I say if these men are not loyal to the government, if they can't read or write in English, you should say that they are unworthy to vote. Now if you look at my proposal, those qualifications only apply to those coming to vote hereafter, those coming to age or becoming naturalized. I reserve to any person who now has the right to vote the right to continue voting unless forfeited by crime. I say to you that there is not a constitution in the whole forty-eight states that has not the requirement of good character indirectly, but I say let us put it in directly. Quite a number of the states have it. Let us have a complete proposition, let us elevate manhood suffrage, and when we have reached the plane of decent manhood suffrage that ought to exist, let us say to the women, "Come and vote with us."

Mr. BROWN of Highland: If that is your proposition, would it not be better, more the part of liberality at least, upon your part to permit the matter to go before the people and then express your opinion at the polls? Ought you not take a broader view and submit the matter in Ohio regardless of your feelings, and let it have a fair trial?

Mr. EVANS: I am in favor of the proposal provided—you will recognize that one hundred and ten years have elapsed since this state was organized. We are not as strict in this proposal as they were in the constitution of 1802. Why under the constitution in 1802 a man in order to vote was required to be charged with a tax, and that was the organic law until 1851.

Mr. PIERCE: If women had the chance to vote would it not be a refining influence at the polls?

Mr. EVANS: I don't think there is a man in the country who would not favor woman's suffrage if he thought the women really wanted it, and my proposal, to which I beg leave to call attention, leaves it entirely to the legislature and that body can pass woman's suffrage at any time. At the proper time I think I shall offer my Proposal No. 81 as a substitute for this report. I simply say that this committee has not gone far enough, and for that reason I feel I am constrained to vote against the report.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Williams: I move that the vote by which the debate was to be closed be reconsidered.

Mr. BOWDLE: I second the motion.

Mr. DOTY: I move to lay that on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was lost.

Mr. THOMAS: I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. DOTY: The motion to reconsider has not been carried.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the house is on the motion to reconsider the motion by which the debate was limited and setting the time of debate at four o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Williams: Is that debatable?

The PRESIDENT: No, sir.

The motion was carried.

Mr. THOMAS. Now I move to amend that the debate close at five o'clock instead of four.

The amendment was agreed to.

The motion was carried.

Mr. MARRIOTT: I regret much that I was not present to hear the address of the author of this proposal. I was asked a few moments ago how I stood on the question under debate, and I answered, "My good friend, in the language of our president, I have no open mind on the question." My mind is not open. I have been in favor of equal suffrage ever since I was old enough to vote. I never could understand why mother might not have voted with me, nor can I understand how under the provisions of our national constitution, which says that every person born or naturalized in the United States is a citizen of the United States and that no state shall abridge the rights or immunities of citizens of the United States, the women can be denied this privilege.

Conceding, therefore, that the women of the country are citizens of the United States, why should not they have the same rights that other citizens of the United States have in the matter of the elective franchise? I am advised that there is a limit placed upon the time of speakers of ten minutes. I want to thank the gentleman from Mahoning [Mr. ANDERSON] for permitting me to say what I have to say at this time, for I expect to be called away tomorrow.

Gentlemen of the Convention, one of the strongest arguments that I can make or that I think can be made in favor of granting the women of this state the small boon that they are asking, to wit, to submit to the people the question as to whether the people of this state will vote to give the women of this state equal suffrage with men, is that the people should rule. I say that I cannot understand how any delegate who believes that the people shall rule can refuse to let the people say whether our wives and mothers and sisters and daughters may be permitted to have a part in this government of ours. I think one of the strongest arguments that I can make will be to refer to a communication which came floating on to my desk a few days ago—and I agree with the gentleman from Hamilton that so long as we have fought out on the floor of this Convention the question of license or no license that it ought not to be brought into the discussion of this question—now I read this communication only for the purpose of commenting on its unfairness and inconsistency. It is sent over the names of the president and secretary of the German-American Alliance of the state of Ohio, urging, as they had a perfect right to do, the delegates of this Convention to vote for the so-called King proposal on the subject of license. Then it goes on, "We also urge upon you the adoption of the initiative and referendum clause, as agreed upon by the United Constitution Committee of Cincinnati," and then they followed that request by this: "The above organization also requests you to use all your personal influence not to have any woman suffrage clause submitted to the people in any manner whatever."

I say that those two requests are radically inconsistent, one asking members of this association to vote

Woman's Suffrage.

for the initiative and referendum, and to submit that question to the people, and then in the same breath and in the same communication appeal to the members of the Convention not to submit the question of woman's suffrage to the people in any manner.

We do not have to use a magnifying glass or a microscope to ascertain who the people are who are opposing woman's suffrage in this good state of Ohio, now more than one hundred years old.

In my judgment it is a part of practical wisdom that we adapt ourselves to the times in which we live. If we do not we will find ourselves standing alone while other states are pressing forward and winning the battles of life.

If we are to be progressive in fact and not in theory only, we must keep abreast of the progressive states of the Union, and not let such states as California, Washington, Colorado, Idaho, Utah and Wyoming blaze the way in every progressive movement.

Ohio should lead more and follow less. Our motto should be: "Ohio Leads," and not "Ohio Follows."

California is the last of the states named to give her women equal suffrage with men, and we heard that great leader of the progressive movement of the West, who is firing the hearts of the citizenship of the Pacific coast, Governor Johnson, of California, say what woman's suffrage is doing for that state.

Not one of these states so far as I have learned, would today take a backward step in this progressive movement of equal suffrage, and why should Ohio do less for her women than California and these other states have done for their women?

Are the women of Ohio less intelligent, deserving, brave and true? Will we stand and let Wisconsin, Kansas, Oregon and Nevada also show us the way? I say no, a thousand times no!

For more than sixty years the women of Ohio, our mothers and our wives, have been knocking at the door of equal rights, asking only for simple justice, and the doors have not been opened to let them in.

I say this is to the everlasting shame of the men of Ohio. Today that army of mothers and wives is joined by our sisters and our daughters, and they are now unitedly appealing to this Convention for simple justice, appealing to be emancipated from the slavery in which men have held them for all these years.

Will we longer close our ears to their appeal and refuse their prayer? I say emphatically no.

I have too much confidence in the gallantry, the manhood, and the patriotism of the men who compose this Convention to believe for one moment they will be so unjust to the noble women of Ohio.

If I had a heart so indifferent and cold, so destitute of human justice, as to say by my vote that the women of Ohio are at least not the equals of the colored man, I would feel ashamed to again meet the mother of my boys.

Mr. STALTER: May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MARRIOTT: I will thank the gentleman if he will contain himself until I have finished. My time is limited.

I would feel that I was not entitled to her respect, much less her love, and I would not lose either for all the wealth of the world, for I say the sweetest thing in

this life is the unclouded welcome of a pure and loving wife. Her love is of priceless value, and a good wife is heaven's best and richest gift to man, and I say the sweetest words in the English language are: "Mother, wife and home."

Home embraces them all, for where there is no mother or wife there is no home, and the man who has never heard the merry laugh of a little child in his home has missed much of the sweetness of life.

Universal suffrage is no longer a dream, but is a progressive fact, as is shown by the several states named which have broken the shackles of slavery and granted to women equal rights with man.

In Ohio we have been generous enough to make them equal with the men in the right to own and hold property and pay taxes to support the government, yet we have denied them the right to have a voice in that government.

Taxation without representation is and has always been odious to every true American.

Our forefathers, under the slogan "Rebellion against tyrants is obedience to God," gave us our independence; that is, gave the men their independence, but left our women slaves.

Is not one hundred and thirty-six years long enough to earn freedom? Have our American women not proven themselves worthy during these long years of probation? What more do we want? What additional sacrifice do we require? Is she not the equal of man, yea is she not his superior?

If we men of Ohio, we, "the lords of creation," will not admit that our wives and our mothers are our equals, we will at least admit that they are the equal of the black man.

The time of the gentleman here expired and on motion of Mr. Okey, seconded by Mr. Nye, his time was extended five minutes.

Mr. MARRIOTT: I thank the members of the Convention. I met the same difficulty the other evening when I was addressing the Convention on the license question.

We gave the colored man the ballot fifty years ago and it cost us the best blood of the land to do it. Are we willing to do less for our mothers, our wives, our daughters, than we have done for the colored man?

Perhaps it may be true that we cannot control their votes as some have controlled the votes of the wards of the Civil War. God grant that it may be true.

In this connection a good friend of mine said a moment ago that he feared that the giving of the ballot to the women of the state might disrupt the homes. If I thought such a thing would occur when it comes to a vote I would vote against giving them the ballot, because I could not be induced to do anything that would disrupt the homes. But it will not disrupt the homes, because the men will not control the women's vote and the husband will not control the wife's vote. Right there let me say if we give the women of Ohio the right to vote between now and next fall there will be a division in my home. I will find Mrs. Marriott walking up to the polls with me and casting her vote for Teddy Roosevelt while I cast mine for Judson Harmon. And I don't think when Harmon goes down to Washington my wife will have any quarrel with me over it either.

Woman's Suffrage.

Mr. LAMPSON: Don't you think your wife will win out at the election?

Mr. MARRIOTT: If she does I will take her by the hand and say "God bless you."

We have been for two weeks discussing the liquor question, trying to find a way to lessen the evils resulting from the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

I want to say here, and emphasize the statement, that high license with strict regulation and woman's suffrage go hand in hand in the contest for sobriety in Ohio.

Our boasted claim of a popular government, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, so long as one-half of the people are deprived of a voice in our government is a farce and a delusion.

With a citizenship of about ninety million people, outside of the states that have given the women the ballot one-half of our citizenship is disfranchised, and hence deprived of a voice in shaping the policies of government, and yet we boast of a republican form of government, a government by the people!

Section 4 of article IV of the federal constitution provides that: "The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government."

Yet in the face of this guaranty no state of this Union has in fact a republican form of government which refuses equal rights and equal privileges to all its citizens.

A so-called popular government which deprives one-half of its citizens the privilege of citizenship is a false pretense and is not a popular government in fact but in name only, and every state which withholds from its women the right to have a voice in its government violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the federal constitution.

Women are citizens, so declared by the constitution of the United States, and the state constitution which deprives any portion of her citizens of equal privilege with all other citizens is conceived in unwisdom and born of injustice.

A constitution which fails to guard the integrity of American citizenship, and to give all its citizens equal protection of law and participation in government, is and always will be a failure, because it is lacking in inherent honesty.

A successful and permanent government must rest primarily on recognition of the right of its citizens and the absolute sovereignty of its people. Upon these principles is built the superstructure of our republic. Their maintenance and perpetuation measure the life of the republic. These principles stand for the rights and liberties of the people, and for the power and majesty of the government. A republic, therefore, which does not recognize justice and equal rights to all its citizens cannot and ought not longer endure.

The greatest boon of American citizenship is the right to participate in government. When one-half of the citizenship is deprived of this right our boasted claim of a government of the people, by the people and for the people is a false claim, and Lincoln might well have said that "ours is a government, only we are ruled by men and not by man."

Why are the women of our state denied the privilege of the ballot? Why are they not permitted to have a voice in shaping the policies of our government?

The PRESIDENT: The time is up. The president

wishes to say that following the custom here speakers have been listed and there are a dozen. Now there is only time for six speakers and if the speakers will voluntarily reduce their time we may be able to get through.

Mr. ELSON: I was not aware of that custom and I have not taken any steps to get my name on the list. Is there no other way in which we can get recognition?

The PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes the delegate from Cuyahoga [Mr. HAHN].

Mr. HAHN: I for one am in favor of woman's suffrage and the reasons I will state in brief.

I am in favor of woman's suffrage because woman has an equal interest in our political life. A century ago whenever a woman desired to enter into any other sphere of activity than the domestic life she was met with a storm of ridicule and told, "Keep away, only the house and the home is your proper sphere." But did she keep away? No. The more she was repressed the more she forced herself forward, and what was the consequence of it? There is not a sphere of human activity in literature, in art, in industry and so on in anything, where woman has not proved the equal and in some respects even the leader of man. Just look at literature. A great many thousands of good books and excellent contributions to the magazines and journals enlightening the people are beautiful testimonies of her brilliant qualifications. Even in the higher branches of literature they excel as shining lights.

Go to Harvard University. They have the grandest observatory in the United States of America, and who is the chief of it? Astronomy is a science that has always been considered the queen of all sciences. Women are leading, not merely in the Harvard observatory in the East, but also in its southern branch, and are doing original work, and why should women so admirably endowed be precluded from a political sphere? Women pay taxes, and, as has been already said here by the honorable judge from Delaware, the American principle is "no taxation without representation." Women are wage-earners; and shall she, who is supporting herself and her children and her family, have no right to discuss efficiently a matter that concerns her bread? Shall she merely work as a slave? When she is a wage-earner why should she, a wage-earner, not have a right to help to determine every question in connection with the improvement of her social conditions? Women have knowledge, and knowledge is power. Why take away or keep away such power from them? Every power given them will be used for purity, for the good, for the welfare of this commonwealth. If a limb of our body is abused or not treated right there will be trouble in the whole body. The women do not form merely one limb of the body of human society, but they constitute fully one-half of it, and if they have reason to be dissatisfied, if their conditions are such that they have reason to complain, how can we expect to have peace, harmony and prosperity in our commonwealth?

Furthermore, gentlemen, I am in favor of woman's suffrage, not merely for the reasons I have stated, but also because woman is the educator of society. We are proud of our public schools. They are the bulwarks of our liberty, the perennial source of popular education. We consider them the foundation of democracy. We look upon our public schools as a most glorious mon-

Woman's Suffrage.

ument. They command the admiration of all civilized nations. Who has raised our public schools to such a standard? The women teachers have accomplished it.

Now when the women come and ask us for equal suffrage, can we deny it to them?

Let me look back into the past. What does our latest American history show?

We had a terrible Civil War. When the men were called to defend the country the whole North arose like one man in defense of the Union. The men ignored their farms, their factories, their business concerns and they did not care for the millions of treasures it was to cost. They were ready to shed their precious blood for the cause of liberty, for the cause of the Union. Who brought that movement to a focus? A woman! The woman who wrote Uncle Tom's Cabin. And what did the other women do? Were they indifferent when the country was in agony? The same patriotic speeches, the same songs that have fired the souls and hearts of the husbands, inflamed the hearts of the women.

The PRESIDENT: The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOWDLE: I move that the speakers be confined hereafter to three minutes.

Mr. FESS: I believe we ought to make some different arrangements because there are fifteen more people who would like to speak.

The motion of the member from Cincinnati [Mr. BOWDLE] was carried.

Mr. KNIGHT: This Convention devoted two weeks to a free discussion of the good roads question which involved a few dollars. It permitted without limitation a discussion for nearly three weeks of the liquor question. It proposes now to permit about five hours of discussion on a question which affects more than one-half of the people of the state of Ohio in their personal relations to the government of the state and the rest of the community. I protest that of all the instances of unfairness to the women of the state of Ohio this is the greatest. If this question is of importance, and every speaker on the floor today has said substantially it is the most important question that has come before the Convention, if it is the will of the Convention that a man should be limited to three minutes to speak upon this question, we ought to be ashamed of ourselves. I move that the vote by which debate was to be closed at five o'clock be reconsidered.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. DOTY: I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. KNIGHT: And on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were taken, and resulted — yeas 42, nays 56, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

- | | | |
|------------------|------------|-------------------|
| Anderson, | Doty, | Johnson, Madison, |
| Baum, | Dunlap, | Kehoe, |
| Beatty, Morrow, | Fackler, | Kilpatrick, |
| Brown, Highland, | Fess, | Kramer, |
| Cassidy, | Halenkamp, | Longstreth, |
| Colton, | Harbarger, | Ludey, |
| Cordes, | Henderson, | Malin, |
| Crosser, | Hoffman, | Mauck, |
| Davio, | Holtz, | Miller, Ottawa, |

- | | | |
|----------------|------------------|---------|
| Okey, | Smith, Hamilton, | Ulmer, |
| Peck, | Solether, | Wagner, |
| Rockel, | Tallman, | Walker, |
| Shaffer, | Tannehill, | Watson, |
| Smith, Geauga, | Tetlow, | Woods, |

Those who voted in the negative are:

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Antrim, | Harris, Hamilton, | Peters, |
| Beyer, | Hoskins, | Pettit, |
| Bowdle, | Hursh, | Pierce, |
| Brattain, | Johnson, Williams, | Price, |
| Brown, Pike, | Jones, | Read, |
| Cody, | Kerr, | Riley, |
| Collett, | King, | Roehm, |
| DeFrees, | Knight, | Stalter, |
| Donahay, | Kunkel, | Stamm, |
| Dunn, | Lambert, | Stevens, |
| Dwyer, | Lampson, | Stewart, |
| Earnhart, | Leslie, | Stilwell, |
| Elson, | Marriott, | Stokes, |
| Evans, | Marshall, | Taggart, |
| FitzSimons, | McClelland, | Thomas, |
| Fluke, | Miller, Crawford, | Weybrecht, |
| Fox, | Moore, | Wise, |
| Hahn, | Nye, | Worthington, |
| Halfhill, | Partington, | |

The roll call was verified.

So the motion to table was lost.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote whereby the time to close debate on this question was set for five o'clock.

The motion was carried.

Mr. KNIGHT: Now I offer an amendment that instead of closing debate at five o'clock it close at 11:30 tomorrow.

The motion was carried.

Mr. FESS: I now move that we reconsider the vote by which speeches were limited to three minutes.

Mr. DOTY: That was part of the motion that was just reconsidered.

Mr. KING: There is one time that the gentleman from Cuyahoga [Mr. Doty] was not paying attention.

Mr. BOWDLE: I made the motion to limit speeches to three minutes.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I understood that. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which that motion was carried.

The motion was carried.

Mr. WATSON: I now move that the speaker's time be limited to ten minutes.

The motion was carried.

Mr. PETTIT: I move to amend that to fifteen minutes.

The PRESIDENT: The motion to amend comes too late, the other motion is carried. The gentleman from Franklin [Mr. KNIGHT] is recognized.

Mr. KNIGHT: I yield my time to the gentleman who follows me, the member from Greene [Mr. Fess].

Mr. FESS: I should like to ask four questions and I shall try to limit what I have to say to the answers to those four questions.

I am thinking that in all probability I may have the same experience at the next election that my friend from Delaware [Mr. MARRIOTT] expects. For my household, while it is not divided politically in all probability will be divided upon the question of woman's suffrage. I think perhaps the "better two-thirds" of my household will vote against woman's suffrage when the matter

Woman's Suffrage.

comes up, and if I shall accompany her to the polls I shall not vote with her but against her. But that is not an argument that there is going to be a lack of domestic tranquillity.

Mr. BROWN, of Highland: Is it intended by this provision that we are adopting that the women are to vote on the question of whether we shall have equal suffrage?

Mr. FESS: If the member from Highland is itching for information, I will let him get it elsewhere.

All those people are not agreed, the women are not agreed, as to what they should do or what rights they should have, and if the right of suffrage be granted to them it is a question whether they will all use it or not. That argument has been offered against woman's suffrage. I think that was well answered by the author of the bill that even if only one woman wants the right, she should have the right so far as natural right goes, and that we should not deny the right to her. I leave that argument.

Then on the other hand, if we grant suffrage to women and the women themselves don't use it, that is merely their lack of appreciation of the duties that go with responsibility, and it is our business to so emphasize the meaning of responsibility that those who otherwise would be indifferent will cease to be indifferent and exercise the duties that are theirs. Simply because we fear that women will not exercise this privilege is not a substantial argument that we shall not give them the privilege of exercising it if they want to.

Then if women don't exercise it, there are many intelligent men who do not want to exercise it, and there are many unintelligent men who do not exercise it; and why should we refuse to let the women have it simply because we fear they will not exercise it, when men who have it already refuse to exercise it. That is not an argument as I conceive.

Some people say it destroys the chivalry that belongs to womanhood and they say we can see it now; that if we get into a car that is filled with men and a woman comes in and is compelled to hang on to the strap in the street car, the men will not get up and give her a place, and they say that is because we are changing the relationship between man and woman, and woman is coming into a recognition of her rights, and that causes men to lose the chivalry that belongs to her. All I can say about that is this: If I am in a street car and a woman comes in and I still continue to occupy a seat while she stands, that is no argument that she ought not to have the ballot; that is an argument that I am not a gentleman and if the woman gets the ballot I shall still try to be a gentleman the same as I would want to be now in case of meeting her on a plane equal to myself.

Now, there are four questions I want to ask:

1. Does woman need the protection of government?
2. Does woman understand the machinery of government? And if she does not, can she be made to understand it?
3. Is the intelligence of women such that she can exercise good judgment in selecting officers of government?
4. Is woman capable or does her position argue for her the right to participate in government to make her

better understand the position she occupies in this modern time?

Now, answering the first question, I regard that there is no doubt about it, that woman does need the protection of government. She needs it more than man. Woman has every right naturally considered that man has, and one more — she can demand the right of protection from a brother. That is one more than man himself is exercising. Woman needs the protection of government even more in every line of this complex condition of our modern civilization than does man. I believe you will not dispute it.

Second. Since she needs the protection of government, does she understand the machinery of government sufficiently that she can seek the protection if she has the ballot?

I believe that while she has not had the opportunity, and that there may be some limitations upon her ability to exercise this, still we ought to all be at school today. We ought to learn what are the ends of government, and women have not the opportunity now under present conditions to be effective in this great school where we are all trying to become the best citizens possible, and if you give her the opportunity I assure you that she will show that she is capable of understanding the machinery of our government and, therefore, can put into operation the needs of her own protection in the government.

And thirdly, can she exercise intelligent judgment in the selection of officers? I say she can. In a great many ways women are superior to men in judgment. There are today over a million women devoted to study in the various social betterments associations in our land, becoming most effective in the charity work of the country. There are eleven hundred and forty-two women on charitable boards according to the census. There are six hundred and fifteen women on boards of education in England. I am speaking of a foreign country, but if you take the activities in a city like Columbus or Chicago or New York or Philadelphia and analyze the activities that are making for social betterment in the cities, you will find that women are taking a wonderful position, and yet they have not the ballot.

You say let them go on in the good work, without the ballot. I say give them the ballot and let them become a political force as well as a social force and see the added advantage you will have for the woman in her own sphere today.

The next point I want to ask is this: Does woman need the training that comes from the exercise of the ballot? If you answer that she needs it, I ask can she have it — is she capable of it? I know that prior to the fifties it was argued that woman should not be educated in higher educational institutions, and there have been made from the public rostrum statements by brainy men that would be surprising to you in argument that women did not have the ability and intellect to be educated prior to the forties. What do you say now? For every man you will point to in the colleges of today I will point to a woman, and when she is by the side of the man she will prove herself equal to him in her ability, especially along the line of literature and culture studies. And yet men say that if you give her the ballot you will destroy the kind of nature that belongs to her. I deny it. Instead of the ballot destroying in women the finer nature

Woman's Suffrage.

it will add to her influence to elevate the plane of politics. And why do I want women to vote when the better side of my household would rather not have that privilege? I answer you, there are a great many questions today that man, in the language of Judge Peck, has not been able yet to solve. We ought to have her influence, which is superior to that of man, infusing itself into the body politic of America, and especially of Ohio. It will purify politics. Who is the maker of the citizen today? Who teaches the schools of our public school system? Who maintains the membership of the churches of today? Who has the finger upon the production of the better citizenship today? It is the father? The father leaves the home and he is busy.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Williams: I move that the time of the gentleman be extended.

Mr. FESS: I don't want it. I want to give all a chance to speak on this matter, as I feel like Dr. Knight that it is important.

The PRESIDENT: The member has yet two minutes.

Mr. FESS: I was going to put a question, but I am not sure that it has not escaped me now.

I believe the point I was trying to make, was the influence of the mother in producing citizens. I will give it in a word. The fathers are too busy. They are in the home for a few hours. Men come home so infrequently that the little boy in the home is apt to ask his mother who the stranger was who came here last. That represents in an extreme way a good many homes in the city. The father is too busy. He is in a work-a-day world and the result of his extreme activity—and I use that guardedly—he leaves to the mother the bringing up of the children. Where are the sons, in whose hands? In the hands of our women. I want to know what are the influences that teach citizenship? The schools and the churches and the homes. How much influence has the father in the home over the children in producing citizenship? How much in the school? How much in the church? If the children are constantly under the mothers and that citizenship must come through that influence, how can the woman emphasize the political virtues in citizenship if she has no chance to participate in anyway? I leave the question with you. I leave it as Judge Peck did. We are not voting now for woman's suffrage—we are giving the people the right to say whether women shall vote or not, and when you give them that chance to vote on the subject, I shall use my influence upon the platform to have the men themselves see that we can regenerate in some manner the body politic of the state of Ohio by the influence of the mothers and sisters and wives, whose presence alone will not deteriorate, nor degenerate, but will uplift.

The PRESIDENT: The names on my list now in order are Worthington, Watson, Anderson, Jones, McClelland, Stalter, King, Thomas, Knight, Elson, Fitz-Simons, Bowdle, Johnson, Pettit and Kramer. It takes two hours and forty minutes under the rule to complete those speeches.

Mr. WORTHINGTON: Unfortunately I differ with some men as to my duty in this Convention. To my mind one of the evils of representative assemblies for some time has been the shirking of responsibility. Members of the general assembly are apt to say when a question of the constitutionality of any law comes up, "We

will let that alone, the courts will consider that." Then when they are required to consider whether a law is wise or expedient they say "The governor will attend to that," and pass it along. Now, when I came here I took an oath which, as I understood it, required me to express my own individual judgment upon every measure that was to be submitted to the people; and I do not think we have a right to pass the thing along to the people simply because there are advocates here in support of it. We should consider the merits of a proposition.

Now, upon the merits I do not differ so very much from the gentlemen who have spoken previously. I myself have as high an opinion of the ability of women to exercise the suffrage properly as any of you gentlemen have. But there is another difficulty. One of our troubles now is an uninterested electorate. We have proposals here to punish men for not doing their duties in exercising the elective franchise. Some of these days we may have to come to that. If you increase your electorate by adding people who do not care to vote, you increase the trouble and difficulty from that cause.

Now, is it not wise, is it not fair to see whether the women of the state of Ohio really want this duty imposed upon them? I say duty because the franchise is not in my opinion a privilege or a gift. It is the duty that rests upon every citizen to exercise it at the polls, everytime a question comes up, according to the best of his knowledge and ability. If the women of the Ohio were coming before the people and saying we want to help you in this task of government, I would say to them, "Come, we are glad of your assistance, and you can help us, and you can do us good." But if it is not the women of Ohio, if it is one or two or three or a thousand—I don't care what the number is, if it is small—I do not think we are denying them a right when we say to them you cannot vote because your sisters do not want to. I do not think there is any right in the question of suffrage or in the matter of suffrage. It seems to me that it is not in accordance with our duty to simply pass this question along to the men of Ohio, and say, will you give suffrage to the women of Ohio, some of whom we know don't want it and some of whom we know do want it?

I should think the first thing to be done would be to ascertain what percentage of the women of Ohio are interested in this matter, and therefore I have prepared an amendment, which I shall offer as soon as I leave the floor, which will require four weeks before the question is submitted to the men of Ohio, that the same question shall be submitted to the women of Ohio, and that they shall have opportunity of voting and saying whether they want suffrage or not; and if a majority of the women who vote on that question say they want the suffrage, then no matter how small the vote may be, the question will be submitted to the men at the time stated in the proposal; but if the majority of the women who vote on that question say they do not want to vote, then the question will be determined. I submit that that is fair and it is all the proponents of this proposal can ask. First it puts it up the women of Ohio, and enables the men to vote intelligently, with the light given to them in this way by the expression of opinion of the women of Ohio.

I offer this amendment.

The amendment was read as follows.

Woman's Suffrage.

Amend Proposal No. 91 as follows:

Add the following after line 29:

SECTION 6. All the foregoing provisions, however, are conditioned as follows:

(a) Four weeks before the date of the election referred to in section 1 hereof there shall be submitted to the female citizens of Ohio over twenty-one years of age, who are proposed to be made electors by said proposal, the question whether they desire to exercise the duty of suffrage.

(b) All laws relating to the length of residence requisite to entitle an elector to vote, to the registration of electors at special elections, and to the proclamation and conduct of elections, and ascertaining the result thereof, shall apply to such submission, and to female citizens desiring to vote thereat.

(c) At such submission, the ballot shall be in the form specified in section 2 hereof.

(d) The female citizens desiring to express their views as to said proposal shall, as to those who favor the adoption of said proposal as a part of the constitution, indicate their wish by placing a cross-mark within the blank space opposite the words, "For Woman's Suffrage," and as to those opposed to such adoption, indicate their wish by placing a cross-mark within the blank space opposite the words, "Against Woman's Suffrage."

(e) If at such submission the votes for woman's suffrage shall exceed the votes against woman's suffrage, then the election called for by section 1 hereof shall be held; otherwise said election shall not be held, and said proposal shall be withdrawn.

Mr. KILPATRICK: We want it possible to submit this proposition to the electors of the state and we want the proposal put up to them so that they can vote on it. For that reason I move at this time that this amendment be laid on the table.

Mr. WORTHINGTON: And on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were taken, and resulted — yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Baum,	Hahn,	Pettit,
Beatty, Morrow,	Halfhill,	Pierce,
Beyer,	Holtz,	Read,
Brown, Highland,	Kehoe,	Rockel,
Cassidy,	Kilpatrick,	Shaffer,
Colton,	Kramer,	Shaw,
Crites,	Lambert,	Smith, Geauga,
Crosser,	Lampson,	Solether,
Davio,	Leete,	Stalter,
DeFrees,	Longstreth,	Stevens,
Doty,	Malin,	Stewart,
Dunn,	Marriott,	Stilwell,
Dwyer,	Mauck,	Taggart,
Farnsworth,	Moore,	Tannehill,
Farrell,	Nye,	Watson,
Fess,	Okey,	Weybrecht,
FitzSimons,	Peck,	Wise,
Fluke,	Peters,	Woods,

Those who voted in the negative are:

Antrim,	Donahey,	Fox,
Bowdle,	Dunlap,	Halenkamp,
Brown, Pike,	Earnhart,	Harris, Ashtabula,
Cordes,	Elson,	Harris, Hamilton,
Cunningham,	Evans,	Hoffman,

Hoskins,	Leslie,	Riley,
Hursh,	Ludey,	Roehm,
Johnson, Madison,	Marshall,	Stamm,
Johnson, Williams,	McClelland,	Tallman,
Jones,	Miller, Crawford,	Thomas,
Kerr,	Miller, Ottawa,	Ulmer,
King,	Partington,	Wagner,
Knight,	Price,	Worthington,
Kunkel,	Redington,	

The roll call was verified.

So the motion to table was carried.

Mr. WATSON: In my present condition physically, I shall occupy your time for only a few moments, simply to add my weight to what has been given before in favor of woman's suffrage. I wish to consider the three foundation stones on which human society rests, home, church and state.

No one can question the work that the women have done to elevate to the present high standard the American home. No one can question the amount of effective work that the women have done to elevate to the present condition the affairs of the church. Having been tried and tested as to her efficacy in those two lines, no one should call into question the effectiveness of her work if she be granted that wider and broader field to the uplift of humanity in affairs of state.

I can not be called a pessimist; rather may I be called an optimist. If we but revert to the ages that have passed before us, and consider the condition of the women in those times as compared with that of today, we would readily note that her sphere in life is broadening, her influence is growing greater from day to day. Only a few short years ago the birth of a female child in a family was considered a calamity. She was looked upon as a mere hireling, a servant, a serf, a slave, an underling. She could come into the possession of no property. One of the first things our fathers gave us, in the ordinance of 1787, was to put her in company with her brothers in the family in line with the succession of property if a man died without a will.

It has been said here that families may be divided. I want to say for my own family, if my wife had a vote, and if she were permitted to go the polls with me, side by side, there would be no division, but there would be two votes cast for Woodrow Wilson for president of the United States. We have been of that political faith from 1896 down to the present time. A few short years after we had made up our minds in the family to turn from the republican party to the democratic party, we stood side by side and had one of the members of the family baptized William Bryan Watson.

The question has been asked here, how can a woman best be a mother. Let me counter that by asking how can a man best be a father? I want to see my girls brought to the same level politically as my boys. We don't deny them the right of property, and why should we deny them the right to vote, to say how that property should be taxed? Many women in this state have bank stock and yet they have not one vote or voice to say how that stock shall be guarded. Many of them have deposits in bank and they have no vote in making the law to take care of those deposits. Many of them own farms and they have no voice or vote in saying how those farms shall be taxed. I fancy if those women who own farms were members of this Convention they would stand as

Woman's Suffrage.

the rest of the farmers stand, against the classification of the property for taxation. Let us grant to the people of Ohio through the referendum the right to say whether the women of the state will be given the right of the franchise. No one who favors the initiative and referendum should, for one moment, hold himself aloof from this vital question. Ohio should take a front rank

in the sisterhood of states in this as in all other questions.

Now I am going to leave the matter with you, and for my part I expect to vote for the submission of this question, and when once submitted I expect to take the platform in behalf of it.

On motion the Convention here recessed until tomorrow morning at 9:30.