

as able to pay, but who were not willing to pay, after the obligation had actually been imposed upon them; after they had been standing years and years we had to discharge them.

I am not aware of the precise number of men who do not pay the one dollar in the city of Baltimore. My colleague who was in the board before I was thinks that not more than one-half. I think that probably one-third or one-fourth at any rate do not pay the one dollar, and there would be more who would not pay if the commissioners did not really require it.

The hour having arrived for taking up the order of the day, being the report of the committee on the judiciary department.

On motion of Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's,

It was postponed until after the consideration of the report of the committee on education.

The question then recurring upon the adoption of the amendment submitted by Mr. MILLER.

Mr. DANIEL resumed: When I first saw this proposition in the bill on yesterday, I was inclined to favor striking out that part of it, and leaving it to the superintendents to decide; but upon consideration I thought perhaps it was well enough to let that remain, and let the schools be free throughout the State, as it does not interfere with our system. In the city of Baltimore, we have found that the one dollar system works very well, has increased the schools, and brought into the schools a class of persons we should not have otherwise. I believe that such a course will work well in the counties. I shall therefore vote for the imposition of a tax, and shall vote for the section as it is, allowing free schools without taxation to be had in the counties, and this does not interfere with our system in the city of Baltimore. But I merely rose to put myself right as to the question of fact.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. How much is paid by that sort of taxation?

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Is it \$1,000 or \$100,000 in the counties?

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know; and I do not know that it is necessary to know in order to settle the question about the city of Baltimore.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I was speaking of the State—not of the city—and by the book too.

Mr. DANIEL. When in the county of Somerset I was president of the board for a long time; and everybody wanted to get free there in the same way.

Mr. EDELEN. I do not propose to consume time in arguing this question; but I desire merely to put the house right on the reference made to some of the counties by the gentle-

man from Baltimore city (Mr. Stockbridge.) I understood him to say that in most if not all the counties of the State, the parents of children who went to the primary schools were required to pay a certain amount. I will state that in reference to Charles county the law has never required that parents of children attending schools supported by this fund should be required to pay. The schools are as free, under certain limitations and restrictions with regard to districts, &c., as the air we breathe.

I desire to call the attention of the convention to one point arising under this last section which we are now considering, namely, the question of taxation. We all know that from causes which it is not necessary for me here even to advert to, we in Maryland, not only in Southern Maryland, not only on the Western Shore and Eastern Shore, where we have been despoiled of our property by the action of this convention, but throughout the State, there never has been a time in our history when the people were so little able to endure heavy taxation. Gentlemen keep studiously out of sight the fact that we are required to pay, and will be required perhaps to pay for years to come heavy amounts for a national tax, as something that has been unknown to us heretofore. It strikes me as passing strange that with all these facts staring gentlemen in the face they should be willing to impose additional taxation. My friend from Baltimore city said last night that Charles county had not lost by this war more than he or his people were losing; that he in his business had been expending \$2,000 or \$3,000 in supporting his family, and had not been making one cent since 1860. I submit to the most zealous friends of public education here, if this be the time to pass a law raising a fund for public instruction, or any other purpose, that is to operate *in futuro* and weigh down the energies of the people for years to come. Why not let us provide for the present; for our immediate wants? Why tax our overburdened people this day, to provide for the wants of those who are to live twenty years hence? Why take any step to raise a permanent fund? Can it be insisted here that the people of the State will not be as able fifteen or twenty years hence to pay money for the support of public schools as they now are? Why, at this time, seek to make a fund from the interest of which you are to support this primary school system? I say therefore that I am altogether opposed to that branch of the proposition.

I say further that the amendment of my friend from Prince George's is very proper and right and should be adopted by this convention. We have already, last night, passed a section, under the operations of which, whether rightfully or wrongfully it is not now for me to argue, we are certain to have this uniform school system after the next legisla-