

point. The gentlemen who preceded him had said all that could be said on the subject. He would however notice in a few words, some of the positions of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Donaldson.) The case put by him of the capitalist who lives among us while his estate is located elsewhere, does not meet the argument. In the first place he pays taxes on his property under the laws of the State in which it is located, and in the next place he spends all his income among us. It is better, to be sure, for us to have capital and men both, but I am not for driving away or taxing a man who is willing to spend large revenues among us merely because his property is not here. If we cannot have the man with his capital, I will take him with his revenues. These go into circulation and trade, and are thus of advantage to us. The gentleman says his certificate of Stock in his pocket or drawer is property in the State. Mr. T. disagreed. But if the certificate is property here because of his possession of it, suppose he leaves it in the hands of his agent or broker in the State where the Stock is, what protection is allowed him then? The same argument may be made as reasonably, and be as well met in regard to any other property beyond the State. If one holds a bond of a person in another State our courts afford no remedy for recovering the debt, and yet the bond is taxed for the support of government here.

And again, if the certificate is the property, a man who holds stock in one of our banks, should pay double taxes; first, on the stock itself, because that is property—another on the certificate, because that is the evidence of his property.

According to the gentleman's theory, a man should not pay any tax on his bank stock located here, if he happened to reside beyond the State, because the tax must be paid where the certificate is held. A man who has stock in another State, and lives among us, is taxed because he does not invest here—while one who lives in another State, and holds stock here, is taxed because he has invested here. You tax the property in one case for being in the State—and you tax the man in the other case, because his property is not here. In the former case we tax him for the protection actually afforded, and in the other respect of the benefits he might derive from our institutions, if the property were here. It is said this is necessary to prevent persons sending their capital beyond the State. This is no answer to the injustice of the act; and besides, instead of bringing property here for investment we are likely to drive the man away too—thus losing a citizen with all the advantages to be derived from the expenditure of his revenues among us. All these taxes can be put on another ground, not liable to any objection.

Let us provide for an income tax which will reach the revenues, and salaries and income of all who have no property here, or which the tax laws can operate. We shall then make persons contribute for the support of government, in respect of the protection afforded to their persons as well as property.

Mr. T. repeated that he had no intention to interfere with the present system of taxation. We

are providing for the future. He was for leaving the power with the legislature. But, if we make any declaration on the subject, let it be clear and explicit, so as to prevent the complaints that were made against some of the present laws.

Mr. DONALDSON replied briefly to gentlemen, who had spoken in favor of his colleague's amendment. After hearing their arguments, his opinion remained unchanged. He recapitulated the points on which he based that opinion. The gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Thomas,) did not seem to be aware that we already taxed the public loans of our State, and the stocks held by non-residents in our State corporations. Such was the fact. He seemed to think, also, that we were endeavoring to subject to taxation, property which heretofore had been exempt. But the laws of the State have all along taxed such property, and the tax has been regularly collected. Whether the law was consistent with the meaning of the old bill of rights, was a point which had never been contested, and, therefore, there had been no decision upon it, in our supreme court. The ground of the law was that all personal property, followed by the person; and the words "within the State," in the old bill of rights, had been struck out by the committee, in order to exclude a doubt. It must be remembered, further, that the certificate of stock, the evidence of the debt, was actually in the possession of the owner.

Mr. D. said, that he differed from the gentleman from Frederick, (Mr. Thomas,) and the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Tuck,) who regarded protection to the particular property itself, the sole ground of taxation. Protection to the person—protection in the prosecution of his business—the advantages derived from the public expenditures that create or foster, the mode from which the citizen is enabled to accumulate wealth—all must be considered as the sources of the power to impose taxation. If a State had not power to prevent immense masses of wealth accumulated here, from being put out of the reach of taxation, whilst its possessor still enjoys all the advantages of his residence and citizenship, then there can never be an approach to equality in the distribution of the burdens of government. The honest and patriotic must pay for the dishonest and the selfish. If such an exemption, as that proposed, is adopted, we shall be obliged, before a great while, to resort to an income tax as the only adequate remedy for such injustice.

It had been said that the collection of the tax was impracticable. This was a mistake. Some frauds and evasions would take place under every system of tax laws. The honest always have to contribute more than their due proportion; but with the present provisions of our law, it would be impossible to dispose of one specific piece of property, and get a deduction on the assessment books on account of it, without answering, on oath, as to the manner in which the purchase money received has been applied, and the new investment would be at once changed on those books. If, however, this exemption prevails, any amount of property may be deducted from