

Mr. D. then proceeded to state several cases by way of illustration. A man engaged in a successful business in the city of Baltimore, may accumulate, from year to year, vast profits, growing rich from the great advantages he derives from the system of internal improvements, which has cost the State and city together, upwards of twenty millions of dollars, and from all that the city has spent in the improvement of her harbor; whilst he is protected in person, in property and in the quiet pursuits of his business, by the laws of the State and city. All his profits, as fast as they accumulate, he may, if the amendment prevails, invest in stocks of other States, and he may thus convey out of the reach of taxation, say four-fifths of his property. On the other hand, a man of small property, whose earnings barely support and educate his family, must pay taxes on the whole of his worth. A farmer, who expends his profits, not generally very large, in improving his land, and adding to his buildings and stock, finds that the increased value is added to his assessment. He must pay a tax on the whole. Thus those most benefitted by the expenditures of the State, and most able to bear the burden, would have to pay far less, in proportion, than their proper share; and their deficiency must be made up by an increased tax, on men more honest and poorer. To make this exemption, would create the greatest inequality, and directly encourage the dishonest evasion of taxes.

But, (continued Mr. D.) this exemption would injure all the holders of public and private stocks here, by diminishing their market value. It would discourage the investment of our home capital, in the improvement of our lands, in building up factories and furnaces, and in various industrial occupations; for all these are subject to taxation here, whilst the same capital invested abroad, would enjoy an exemption.

It is said that the present state of the law, or of legislative practice, prevents men of capital from coming into the State, and bringing part of their means with them. A Boston capitalist, worth five hundred thousand dollars, may wish to bring one hundred thousand dollars here, and leave the remainder invested at his former home. There might be such a case, but it is merely exceptional. Very few men will come here merely for the sake of a fancy residence; and the amount of capital excluded in this way, is but trifling compared with what would be driven out by the exemption proposed. Undoubtedly the fact that we suffer such heavy taxation, does tend to discourage men of capital from settling here. It cannot be otherwise, and it is certainly to be regretted; but the great growth of Maryland, within the last ten years, in wealth and population, demonstrates that the effect of our works of internal improvement, has been to make the State more desirable, as a residence, for active and enterprising men, than it would have been if no such works had been projected; and, consequently, no such taxes levied. Active, enterprising, business men, of small capital, are those who come from other States, to seek a residence among us; and such men are the most valuable accessions to our community.

Mr. D. concluded by saying, that we had not a great many years longer to bear the weight of our taxes. The public mind had become content under them, and, at present, it would be unwise in any essential particular, to change the system.

Mr. THOMAS stated that, until this morning, he did not know that such an amendment as this was pending. It was a very important proposition, and he had been turning it over in his mind, and had satisfied himself that it would produce a change in our policy which would work injustice. He would take an illustration, by applying the new principle to the localities with which he was familiar. He would take, for example, the counties of Harford, Cecil, Frederick, Carroll, Washington and Alleghany, in all these there were numerous landholders who possessed property over the line of one of the adjoining States. What would be the response from these counties, if we were to impose a tax on our citizens for this property lying beyond the limits of the State? It would be repudiated. For what reason do we impose a tax on property within the State? It is because the State gives it in return protection against robbery and other dangers to which it is liable in an unprotected state. So, in regard to personal property, we make laws for the enforcement of contracts, and in other ways to secure this kind of property, and we tax personal property on the principle of protection. Maryland has, in her exigency, been compelled to resort to heavy taxation, and the change of policy looks to the taxation of the property of our citizens, personal as well as real, lying without the limits of the State. If one of our citizens had left the State and gone to California, and obtained property there, would it be right to tax his property there for the purpose of keeping up in this State, roads and highways in which he was not interested, and would he not refuse to pay such tax? He, (Mr. T.,) would vote against any attempt to impose a tax on real estate lying out of the State, because, it ought only to be taxed where its rights are protected by law. So ought personal property to stand in the same position. We cannot change the policy of Virginia and of the other States of the Union. Maryland may adopt the policy of taxing her State stocks, and he would vote for it; or she might impose a tax on the banking capital in the State, or on insurance stocks, or any other personal property within the State. That is, all stock in the State of Maryland, and we have a right to tax it. But it would be injurious to Maryland, if holders of foreign stock were taxed here, because there is more stock held by foreign holders in Maryland, than by citizens of Maryland in foreign stocks. He did not believe that other States would tax these stocks, and the effect of taxing the stocks of other States in the hands of our citizens, would be to drive them beyond the reach of our taxation. Tax the amount of the certificate of stock in his hands, and you drive him from your State. If his income be \$30,000 a year and he has employed it in diffusing benefits round him, you deprive the State of those benefits hereafter. So as to bank stocks, a great deal of it is held by persons who are not citizens