

as was consistent with the terms of our obligations.

The works of internal improvement were not designed for the benefit of the present generation only. This result could never have been anticipated even, because their extent and character made it evident that the main advantage would be derived from the future. And, although the responsibility which we assume, imposes on us the duty of taking our fair share of the burden we have created, yet those who derive the chief advantage our investment, should also contribute to the discharge of the liability.

Again, it would seem reasonable that this scale of taxation should be gradually reduced. The gradation would maintain the equipoise in the value of property in this State, which would else be suddenly disturbed if the whole burden were removed at once. Frudence, no less than justice, would require reductions running through a series of years. He would gladly provide for a diminution, following a certain per centage; say five cents in the hundred dollars, in every period of three years, until the whole debt was discharged. But he could not support the proposition as it now stood. It was not necessary to the credit of the State, for there was no risk following upon gradual reduction in taxation.

Mr. JENIFER now offered the following amendment, (which he had yesterday indicated his intention to offer to the then pending proposition of Mr. JACOBS.)

Amend the first branch of the amendment by adding, at the end thereof, the words "except by an act passed at one session, submitted to the people and re-enacted at the next succeeding session of the Legislature."

Mr. JENIFER did not see the necessity for the insertion of any restriction in the organic law. He saw no necessity, either for restricting or for urging on the Legislature in reference to taxes. If the question was to be taken now, he would wish to make the first proposition so as to prevent any restriction on the Legislature, to take off the taxes, when, in their discretion, they may think it ought to be done. He was opposed to taking off the taxes, until the debt was paid; but when the debt was paid, he would wish taxation to cease. He was not so clear on the point that the last tax which would be repealed, would be the tax on land. If the modification he had suggested was adopted, he would vote for the proposition; if not, he must vote against it.

The auxiliary tax, as it was called, did operate more on Baltimore than any other part of the State, but it should be recollected that she received nearly all the benefits from these works of internal improvement, and if that tax should be repealed, the burden must fall more heavily on the property of the counties, and on those which never expected to derive any direct interest from these works. Much had been said of the large amount of taxes paid from Baltimore. She necessarily pays the largest portion from her wealth and population, but much less in proportion than the advantages derived from being the termini of these great works. Her commerce is enlarged—her wealth increased—her city becom-

ing a rival to the first of the Union—these facts should satisfy gentlemen, that no injustice will be done to Baltimore, by a continuance of these auxiliary taxes until the final extinguishment of the public debt. Then she will receive her fair proportion of the nett revenues arising from these works, and all the advantages they were intended to bestow. For these reasons, (Mr. J. said,) he should not be for disturbing the present system of revenue at any point until the entire liquidation of the public debt.

After some conversation on a point of order, between Mr. SOLLERS and the CHAIR,

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. JENIFER,

And it was rejected.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the first division of Mr. JACOBS' amendment, which was read as follows:

"The Legislature shall not repeal the taxes now imposed for the payment of the public debt, until the revenues and funds of the State shall be sufficient to ensure its ultimate extinguishment within the period limited for its payment."

Mr. BROWN asked the yeas and nays;

Which were ordered.

And being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Blakistone, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Donaldson, Wells, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hodson, Phelps, Bowling, McMaster, Fooks, Jacobs and Waters—16.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Morgan, Dent, Hopewell, Sellman, Weems, Sollers, Jenifer, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Ridgely, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, James U. Dennis, Constable, Chambers, of Cecil, Miller, McCubbin, Grason, George, Wright, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Kilgour, Brewer, Weber, Slicer, Parke, Shower, and Brown—52.

So the first division of the amendment was rejected.

The question then recurred on the second branch of the proposition;

As follows:

"And when the public debt is paid, the surplus revenue derived from the public works of the State, after defraying the necessary expenses of the government, shall be distributed according to the mode provided by the resolution No. 47, of the General Assembly of December session, passed 1833."

Mr. GWINN said that the rule fixed in the second branch was based on a resolution that applied to the school fund. In that view, it was wise enough as a sort of compromise, only for the reason that it was perhaps the easiest way that could be devised of settling a mooted question.

It was now, however, proposed to give it a much wider meaning, by providing that the fund indicated in the second branch should be divided into two parts—one of which should be distributed among the counties and city of Baltimore