

Mayode, N. Y. Oct. 9th 1908

Friday a.m.

Mr H. C. Smith
Cleveland O.

Dear Sir: I ^{or for injury to persons} do not understand
the reference in this clipping
to the "Ohio law" in the matter of
riots. Was the law you were
instrumental in getting passed
when you were in the legislature
on this subject, not effective,
or has it been repealed? —
I should be glad to know
about it.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs) Emma F. Tourgeé

Anti-lynch-murder
The Ohio law
has relation to personal in-
jury & loss of life.
H.C.S.

PROPERTY PROTECTION IN RIOTS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The race riot at Springfield, Ill., with four thousand soldiers for protection in the streets, will serve to recall similar occurrences at Springfield, Ohio, in 1904 and 1906, where sixteen buildings were destroyed. A protective clause in insurance policies protects the companies from loss in such cases—a fact not generally known—and the only resort for property owners is suits against the town, the county or the state. But, unfortunately, the condition of Ohio law is such that no suits can be maintained and none is to be brought. *for loss of property (not life)*

Being unsuccessful in trying to arouse opinion through the press in Ohio for a revision of the laws and for repayment for losses, I placed the matter before the Citizens' League of Springfield, Ohio. Only one of the members expressed his sympathy. I then appealed to a number of them individually and "as good citizens." On no action being manifested, I laid the whole matter before the Governor of Ohio, where it now rests.

Such is the interpretation of Ohio laws of property as against rioters. Yet it is evident that a fundamental principle of property rights and civilization is here at stake. The impression arises that the national government should examine into the status of this question in the different states.

Brooklyn, Aug. 17, 1908. CLARKE DOOLEY.