



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

OHIO CONSTITUTION ARTICLE V, SECTION 4

EXCLUSION FROM FRANCHISE FOR FELONY CONVICTION

The Ohio Constitutional Modernization Commission adopts this report and recommendation regarding Article V, Section 4 of the Ohio Constitution concerning the disenfranchisement of persons convicted of a felony. It is issued pursuant to Rule 10.3 of the Ohio Constitutional Modernization Commission's Rules of Procedure and Conduct.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that no change be made to Article V, Section 4 of the Ohio Constitution and that the provision be retained in its current form.

Background

Article V, Section 4 reads as follows:

The General Assembly shall have power to exclude from the privilege of voting, or of being eligible to office, any person convicted of a felony.

The clear purpose of the provision is to disqualify from voting, and from holding public office, persons who have been convicted of a felony. The provision modifies the broad enfranchisement of United States citizens over the age of 18 who otherwise meet the qualifications of an elector, as contained in Article V, Section 1.¹

Adopted as part of the 1851 Ohio Constitution, the provision was amended in 1976. The word "felony" is not original to the 1851 Ohio Constitution. Before it was revised, Article V, Section 4 stated:

The General Assembly shall have power to exclude from the privilege of voting, or of being eligible to office, any person convicted of bribery, perjury, or other infamous crime.

The section is not self-executing, but empowers the General Assembly to enact laws that exclude felons from voting or holding office, rather than directly disenfranchising. In the exercise of this authority, the General Assembly enacted Ohio Revised Code Section 2961.01, which provides that a person who pleads or is found guilty of a felony “is incompetent to be an elector or juror or to hold an office of honor, trust, or profit.” R.C. 2961.01(A)(1).² When a felon is granted parole, judicial release, or conditional pardon, or is released under a control sanction, the statute provides that he or she is competent to be an elector during that period. R.C. 2961.01(A)(2). Finally, under the statute, a felon is incompetent to “circulate or serve as a witness for the signing of any declaration of candidacy and petition, voter registration application, or nominating, initiative, referendum, or recall petition.” R.C. 2961.01(B).

Amendments, Proposed Amendments, and Other Review

The Ohio Constitutional Revision Commission (“1970s Commission”) recognized that the phrase “infamous crime” was vague and out-of-date, and that the term “felony” would bring the constitutional provision into line with the criminal statutes. The Elections and Suffrage Committee (“E&S Committee”) of the 1970s Commission, in attempting to discern the definition of “infamous crime,” noted that in some states the term is synonymous with “felony.”³ A “felony” generally is described as an offense for which more than a year’s incarceration may be imposed, or an offense otherwise identified as a felony in the particular criminal statute. R.C. 2901.02 (E), (F).

The E&S Committee also was influenced by the enactment in 1973 of the new Ohio Criminal Code (effective January 1, 1974), which created R.C. 2961.01, specifying that felons are disenfranchised only during their incarceration.⁴ The E&S Committee initially recommended no change to the provision’s phrase “bribery, perjury, or other infamous crime,” focusing instead on a proposal to eliminate Section 6 (disenfranchisement of mentally incapacitated persons) and to add the phrase “and any person mentally incompetent for the purpose of voting” to the end of Section 4.⁵

However, on September 19, 1974, the E&S Committee issued a revision of its recommendation, by which it indicated it was no longer recommending that disenfranchisement of the mentally impaired be included in the provision.⁶ The E&S Committee further recommended that reference to eligibility for public office be severed from the provision, instead suggesting that the General Assembly could enact laws to preclude felons from holding public office even after the conclusion of their incarceration. Most importantly, the E&S Committee recommended a change that would substitute the word “felony” for “bribery, perjury, or other infamous crime.”⁷

The 1970s Commission did not approve the E&S Committee’s revised recommendation in full, ultimately only recommending the substitution of the word “felony” for “bribery, perjury, or other infamous crime.” In so recommending, the 1970s Commission articulated its desire “to preserve the flexibility now available to the General Assembly to expand or restrict the franchise in relation to felons in accordance with social and related trends.”⁸ Thus, the 1970s Commission recognized that the constitutional provision needed to track the statutory enactment under the criminal code, which the 1970s Commission recognized as providing that “when a convicted felon is granted probation, parole, or conditional pardon, he is competent to be an elector during

such time and until his full obligation has been performed and thereafter following his final discharge.”⁹

The 1970s Commission recommendation, that Article V, Section 4 read that “The General Assembly shall have power to exclude from the privilege of voting, or of being eligible to office, any person convicted of a felony,” was presented in the 111th General Assembly by resolution pursuant to Am. S.J.R. No. 16, submitted by ballot and approved by voters, with an effective date of June 8, 1976.¹⁰

Litigation Involving the Provision

Although felony disenfranchisement has been challenged under the Equal Protection Clause, it has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court. In *Richardson v. Ramirez*, 418 U.S. 24, 33 (1974), individuals with felony convictions argued that California’s felony disenfranchisement law was unconstitutional because it was not narrowly tailored to meet a compelling state interest. However, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the law on the basis that the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees the right to vote “except for participation in rebellion, or other crime.” *Id.* at 54. The Court therefore found an “affirmative sanction” for felony disenfranchisement laws in the Fourteenth Amendment. *Id.*

The Ohio Supreme Court has cited Article V, Section 4 only a few times, primarily in cases pertaining to eligibility for public office, rather than to the disenfranchisement of felons.

In *Mason v. State ex rel. McCoy*, 58 Ohio St. 30, 50 N.E. 6 (1898), John W. Mason, after being elected Adams County probate judge, was removed from office for buying votes during his campaign. Mason argued that Article V, Section 4 mandated that the only way he could be removed from office was if he had been convicted of a criminal offense. The court disagreed, stating:

The most that can be said for section 4, article 5, of the Constitution of Ohio is that the general assembly is, by it, given the absolute power to exclude any person from the privilege of ever being eligible to an office – it does not contemplate a grant of a right to an office to all persons not so made eligible to hold one.

Id., 58 Ohio St. at ____, 50 N.E. at 16.

In *Grooms v. State*, 83 Ohio St. 408, 94 N.E. 743 (1911), another Adams County voter fraud case, the court considered whether it was unconstitutional for a criminal sentence to include disenfranchisement for five years where the accused pled guilty to selling his vote for ten dollars.¹¹ Against Grooms’ argument that bribery is not an “infamous crime,” the court interpreted the prior version of Article V, Section 4, disenfranchising a person convicted of “bribery, perjury, or other infamous crime,” as indicating bribery is, in fact, an “infamous crime.” Although the decision does not specify the criminal charge, the court’s decision appears to be based on the notion that, regardless of whether selling a vote is categorized as “bribery,” it does meet the definition of “infamous crime,” and so the disenfranchisement was not unconstitutional.



The unsuccessful argument in *Mason, supra*, again was attempted in *In re Removal of Member of Council Joseph Coppola*, 155 Ohio St. 329, 98 N.E.2d 807 (1951), wherein the court reiterated that Article V, Section 4 does not infringe the power of the General Assembly to legislate as to reasonable qualifications for office, or to enact laws providing for the removal of a public officer for misconduct. *Id.*, 155 Ohio St. at 335-36, 98 N.E.2d at 811.

Interpreting the amended, current version of Article V, Section 4, the Ohio Supreme Court in *State v. Bissantz*, 40 Ohio St.3d 112, 532 N.E.2d 126 (1988), addressed whether a person convicted of bribery in office is forever barred from holding public office if his record is expunged. The court concluded the General Assembly was within its authority under Article V, Section 4 to impose qualifications on those who seek public office, and that the prohibition “reflects an obvious, legitimate public policy * * * that felons convicted of crimes directly related to and arising out of their position of public trust should not ever again be entitled to enjoy such a position.” *Id.*, 40 Ohio St.3d at 116, 532 N.E.2d at 130.

Presentations and Resources Considered

On October 9, 2014, Douglas A. Berman, professor of law at the Moritz College of Law, Ohio State University, presented to the committee on felony disenfranchisement. Professor Berman said Ohio is recognized as one of the few states that allow felons to vote once they have been released from incarceration. Stating that voting is a right, privilege, and responsibility, Prof. Berman expressed that the state must have a strong rationale before disenfranchising.

Asserting the disproportionate impact of felon disenfranchisement on minorities, Prof. Berman cited to statistics showing that, while only 0.6 percent of Ohio’s entire voting population is disenfranchised by having a current felony sentence, that rate is four times higher for African Americans, where 2.4 percent of all voting-age Ohioans of this racial category are disenfranchised by having a felony conviction. Prof. Berman noted that approximately 25,000 of the 50,000 prison population in Ohio is African American.

Prof. Berman asserted that re-enfranchised felons are less likely to commit additional crimes because voting allows them to invest in the laws of the state. Upon release from incarceration, the act of voting becomes a strong symbol of re-entry into society, according to Prof. Berman.

Stating his belief that even those currently serving time should be allowed to vote, Prof. Berman stated that Maine and Vermont allow for this without problems, and that the administrative burden of providing voting opportunities to prisoners is diminished by use of absentee ballots. To Prof. Berman, voting engenders a desire to be involved and informed. Prof. Berman added that the voting right is not about punishment, but about a felon’s engagement with the laws to which he is subject.

Proposing a potential change to Section 4, Prof. Berman suggested that it might be amended to include an express provision allowing incarcerated felons to petition the governor to be re-enfranchised.

Discussion and Consideration

Upon discussion, the consensus of the Bill of Rights and Voting Committee was that Ohio's disenfranchisement of felons only during the period of their incarceration is a reasonable approach that appropriately balances the goals and interests of the criminal justice system with those of incarcerated felons.

Upon considering Prof. Berman's suggestion that the section be revised to include a provision allowing the governor authority to grant petitions to vote by incarcerated felons, the committee concluded that the review and/or modification of the governor's authority is not within the purview of the committee's charge. The committee further acknowledged the possibility that the broad scope of the governor's power to grant reprieves, commutations, and pardons under Article III, Section 11 may already encompass an ability to permit felon enfranchisement. Thus, the committee made no recommendation in this regard.

Action by the Bill of Rights and Voting Committee

After formal consideration by the Bill of Rights and Voting Committee on November 12, 2015, the committee voted on November 12, 2015 to issue a report and recommendation recommending that Article V, Section 4 be retained in its current form.

Presentation to the Commission

On December 10, 2015, on behalf of the Bill of Rights and Voting Committee, committee Chair Richard Saphire appeared before the Commission to present the committee's report and recommendation, by which it recommended retention of Article V, Section 4. Chair Saphire explained the history and purpose of the provision, indicating that the committee had determined that it would be appropriate to retain Article V, Section 4 in its current form.

Action by the Commission

At the Commission meeting held January 14, 2016, Jeff Jacobson moved to adopt the report and recommendation for Article V, Section 4, a motion that was seconded by Representative Ron Amstutz. The Commission then discussed the report and recommendation.

Some Commission members expressed concern that Article V, Section 4 gives the General Assembly the power to determine whether felons will be re-enfranchised once they are released. Those members indicated that the voting right should not be subject to legislative will, but should be secured in the constitution. Thus, they expressed an interest in revising Article V, Section 4 to ensure the restoration of voting rights to felons upon their release.

Other members supported retaining Article V, Section 4 as it is, based on their view that Ohio is one of the more permissive states in relation to voting rights for felons. In their view, the General Assembly has appropriately exercised the authority given by Section 4 by enacting statutory law protecting felon voting rights. Members additionally expressed that changing the

constitutional provision would require adding specific language that is more suited to statutory law.

Finally, some members were in favor of retaining the provision so long as the issue could be reconsidered should circumstances warrant.

A roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed by an affirmative vote of 20 members of the Commission, with two opposed.

Conclusion

The Ohio Constitutional Modernization Commission concludes that Article V, Section 4 should be retained in its current form.

Date Adopted

After formal consideration by the Ohio Constitutional Modernization Commission on December 10, 2015, and January 14, 2016, the Commission voted to adopt this report and recommendation on January 14, 2016.

/s/ Charleta B. Tavares
Senator Charleta B. Tavares, Co-Chair

/s/ Ron Amstutz
Representative Ron Amstutz, Co-Chair

Endnotes

¹ Article V, Section 1 provides:

Every citizen of the United States, of the age of eighteen years, who has been a resident of the state, county, township, or ward, such time as may be provided by law, and has been registered to vote for thirty days, has the qualifications of an elector, and is entitled to vote at all elections. Any elector who fails to vote in at least one election during any period of four consecutive years shall cease to be an elector unless he again registers to vote.

² R.C. 2961.01, relating to civil rights of convicted felons, provides:

(A) (1) A person who pleads guilty to a felony under the laws of this or any other state or the United States and whose plea is accepted by the court or a person against whom a verdict or finding of guilt for committing a felony under any law of that type is returned, unless the plea, verdict, or finding is reversed or annulled, is incompetent to be an elector or juror or to hold an office of honor, trust, or profit.

(2) When any person who under division (A)(1) of this section is incompetent to be an elector or juror or to hold an office of honor, trust, or profit is granted parole, judicial release, or a conditional pardon or is released under a non-jail community control sanction or a post-release

control sanction, the person is competent to be an elector during the period of community control, parole, post-release control, or release or until the conditions of the pardon have been performed or have transpired and is competent to be an elector thereafter following final discharge. The full pardon of a person who under division (A)(1) of this section is incompetent to be an elector or juror or to hold an office of honor, trust, or profit restores the rights and privileges so forfeited under division (A)(1) of this section, but a pardon shall not release the person from the costs of a conviction in this state, unless so specified.

(B) A person who pleads guilty to a felony under laws of this state or any other state or the United States and whose plea is accepted by the court or a person against whom a verdict or finding of guilt for committing a felony under any law of that type is returned is incompetent to circulate or serve as a witness for the signing of any declaration of candidacy and petition, voter registration application, or nominating, initiative, referendum, or recall petition.

(C) As used in this section:

(1) “Community control sanction” has the same meaning as in section 2929.01 of the Revised Code.

(2) “Non-jail community control sanction” means a community control sanction that is neither a term in a community-based correctional facility nor a term in a jail.

(3) “Post-release control” and “post-release control sanction” have the same meanings as in section 2967.01 of the Revised Code.

³ Ohio Constitutional Revision Commission (1970-77), Proceedings Research, Volume 5, Elections and Suffrage Committee Research Study No. 25, 2365 (Aug. 20, 1973), <http://www.lsc.ohio.gov/ocrc/v5%20pgs%20195-2601%20elections-suffrage%202602-2743%20local%20govt.pdf> (last visited Aug. 13, 2015).

⁴ Ohio Constitutional Revision Commission (1970-77), Vol. 5, Elective Franchise Recommendations, *supra*, at 2513 (Apr. 22, 1974).

For an in-depth discussion of the 1973 enactment of the Criminal Code, see Harry J. Lehman and Alan E. Norris, *Some Legislative History and Comments on Ohio’s New Criminal Code*, 23 Clev.St.L.Rev. 8 (1974).

⁵ Ohio Constitutional Revision Commission (1970-77), Volume 5, Elective Franchise Recommendations, *supra*, at 2513-16.

⁶ Ohio Constitutional Revision Commission (1970-77), Volume 5, Elections and Suffrage Committee Revision of Committee Recommendation, *supra* at 2586 (Sept. 19, 1974).

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Ohio Constitutional Revision Commission (1970-77), Recommendations for Amendments to the Ohio Constitution, Part 7, Elections and Suffrage, 21-22 (March 15, 1975), <http://www.lsc.ohio.gov/ocrc/final%20report%20index%20to%20proceedings%20and%20research.pdf> (last visited Aug. 13, 2015).

See also Ohio Constitutional Revision Commission (1970-77), Recommendations for Amendments to the Ohio Constitution, Vol. 11, Final Report, Index to Proceedings and Research, Appendix G, 264-65 (June 30, 1977), <http://www.lsc.ohio.gov/ocrc/final%20report%20index%20to%20proceedings%20and%20research.pdf> (last visited Sept. 16, 2015).

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Grooms* was yet another case of vote-buying in Adams County, which had experienced a severe problem with the corrupt practice around the turn of the last century. As described by one author:

During Christmas week, 1910, Judge Albion Z. Blair and a grand jury revealed a state of affairs in this Ohio River county which shocked Ohio and the nation. For thirty years, the testimony disclosed, voters of every class and political affiliation – clergymen, physicians, prominent businessmen, as well as humble farm hands and the village poor – had been selling their votes to candidates for office of either party, whichever was willing to pay the price. When the grand jury completed its work in mid-January, 1911, 1,690 persons – all vote sellers – were indicted and pleaded guilty before Judge Blair. Since his purpose in initiating the probe had been to stop the practice rather than to exact a heavy punishment, his penalties were light. A typical sentence was a fine of twenty-five dollars, with all but five dollars remitted, a prison sentence of six months, at once suspended, and loss of voting rights for five years, which was absolute. The number disenfranchised totaled nearly a third of the voting population.

Hoyt Landon Warner, *Progressivism in Ohio 1897-1917*, 267-68 (1964).

