

of this State shall remain in our midst, it seems to me that it will be incumbent upon the State to educate them, even as a mere measure of safety to the State.

Mr. PUGH. I do not understand the gentleman to contemplate that by his amendment.

Mr. CUSHING. It necessarily introduces that restriction upon the legislature.

Mr. GALLOWAY withdrew the amendment.

Mr. TODD moved that the convention adjourn.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. I propose to say a few words with reference to the amount of taxation that will be imposed upon the people of the State by the adoption of this report as it stands, as a part of the constitution of the State. The sixth section provides for an annual tax of 10 cents on each \$100 dollars of taxable property, and this is a perpetual tax; it is to continue as long as the constitution itself endures. Gentlemen will remember that such a tax will raise \$710,000 per year. Again, the next (the seventh) section, imposes an additional tax of not less than \$300,000 per annum.

Mr. CUSHING. How do you obtain the amount \$710,000?

Mr. MILLER. I take it from the report of the comptroller of 1863, in which the income from direct taxes at 10 cents on the \$100, as I understand it, amounts to \$710,000.

Mr. SANDS. That was at 25 cents on the \$100, I think. The last legislature reduced it to 10 cents.

Mr. HEBB. Ten per cent. on the amount of taxable property was \$239,782 70.

Mr. MILLER. At any rate, there will be a tax of \$289,000.

Mr. CUSHING. Slave property will have to be deducted.

Mr. MILLER. Provision will very shortly be made for a re-assessment of property, which will increase the taxable basis of the State by a very large amount; so that this tax will raise over \$350,000 a year. Then in addition to that, by the seventh section, the general assembly are further to provide by law a fund for the support of free common schools, by the imposition of an annual tax of a not less annual amount than \$300,000. If in the present taxable basis only \$289,000 can be raised by a direct tax of 10 cents on the \$100, in order to raise the \$300,000 the general assembly would have to levy an additional tax of over 10 cents, making an annual tax of over 20 cents upon the \$100, for the support of schools.

Mr. SANDS. I think my friend from Anne Arundel must be laboring under a mistake in saying that it will amount to 20 cents on the \$100. There is a published statement here—

Mr. MILLER. The amount is different in the different counties, and the statement given by the gentleman only shows that the people of the lower counties, Charles and Prince George's, are more liberal in the support of common

schools than the people of other parts of the State. They pay 12 or 15 cents, and in Anne Arundel county it is 12 cents. Now then we are to raise at least \$290,000 a year as long as this constitution endures, for the support of common schools. Then in addition to that we are to raise \$300,000 a year, until the fund amounts to \$6,000,000, which will take some eighteen or twenty years.

There is no provision made at all for the school funds of the separate counties. They have large sums invested now, and there is no provision made as to how they shall be disposed of; the annual interest from the public works, and from the present school fund, which the State holds in bank-stocks, &c., is only provided for. It seems to me that gentlemen must desire to defeat this constitution. If this school system which they are inaugurating in addition to the annual salaries paid to the superintendent, and in addition to the cost of these various officers created by sections two, three and four, is to raise for the next fifteen years over \$500,000 a year, for the support of this system of common schools in the State, it seems to me that it will go a good ways towards defeating the constitution. I do not know of any State in the Union, not even Connecticut, with so large a school fund. In Connecticut, the school fund amounted only to about four millions of dollars, and there was, I think, still a small additional tax imposed on children that went to the school. I do not know of such an extravagant expenditure in any State in the Union as this, which is now proposed for the State of Maryland.

I have no amendment to offer. I am in favor of a common school education, and of making liberal provisions for it; but I think this is too liberal, too expensive to the State, accumulating taxes for the few coming years, when the State is already burdened with taxes, and ought to adopt a more moderate scale of taxation for this purpose.

Mr. CUSHING. The specious nature of the argument we have just heard is I think best displayed by the suggestion made to this house that this proposed taxation will defeat this constitution, when the gentleman that made the argument has not I think yet voted for one article that we have put into the constitution. Consequently that argument is not at all a good argument coming from the source from which it does come. I think we may throw out of consideration altogether an argument coming from that source to such effect, because I think if it was liable to defeat the constitution we should find the gentleman a most stringent urger upon this convention to put it in.

Now I want to show that this decreases the taxation of the State below the tax paid last year. It imposes for the formation of a school fund, and for the support of the school system, a tax of 20 cents on the \$100. I will guaranty that there is hardly a county