

was to save something for the education of this numerous class that his motion was intended to provide.

Mr. CHANDLER here suggested the propriety of postponing the further discussion of this subject until after the vote of the House had been taken on the motion to reconsider. The discussion of the subject of education would then be more properly before the House.

Mr. DAVIS thanked the gentleman from Baltimore county for his suggestion, in which he, (Mr. D.,) concurred; but the gentleman would see that what he had said had been forced from him. If the motion to reconsider should prevail, the opponents of the system of education would then move to reject the whole proposition to relieve the gentleman from Frederick, and those who were now on the record with him against the proposition. He repeated what he had said yesterday, that with the aid of the statistics at hand, were the Convention disposed to listen to them, he would be able to prove that a great expense would be saved to the State by the adoption of a system of education, because, as has been justly said, ignorance is the parent of idleness—idleness of vice and immorality, with its concomitant crime—and crime with all its attendant expense, of loss first—then detection, conviction, and punishment—unless the party gets “scot free” to perpetrate other injuries and depredations.

The question was then stated to be on the motion to re-consider the vote adopting the amendment of Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. FRESSTMAN asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative*—Messrs. Bell, Welch, Lloyd, Colston, Constable, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, Spencer, Grason, George, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Thawley, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Prestman, Ware, Schley, Fiery, Neill, John Newcomer, Michael Newcomer, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Parke, Ege, Cockey and Brown—39.

*Negative*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Blakistone, Dent, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Weems, Merrick, Chandler, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Bowie, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, McMaster, Fooks, Davis, Kilgour, and Smith—31.

So the vote was re-considered.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the amendment of Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. GRASON made some remarks which will appear hereafter.

Mr. CHAMBERS rose to correct impressions which might be made, by what had been said, on the minds of those who had not investigated the history of the school fund. The origin of the school fund, dated a long way beyond the birth day of Carroll county. The first legislation in relation to this subject, will be found to have been more than a century since.

A word or two in reference to the colleges—he meant the two colleges which were made the university, in 1784. By their charters in 1782 and 1784, the Legislature had engaged to endow the colleges, if individuals would advance the funds necessary to establish them. The condition was complied with, and in 1784 the endowment was granted.

Thus was produced a state of things, which in the view of those who had charge of the colleges, brought them completely within the principles established in the supreme court of the United States, in the case of the Dartmouth college, and others of a similar class. In these cases it had been declared that such contracts were inviolable by the State. It happened, however, subsequently, that persons occupied seats in these legislative halls, who entertained notions in regard to the education of our citizens, very different from those entertained by our intelligent and judicious ancestors. Such notions, as we now hear from some quarters, obtained the ascendancy, and the colleges were deprived, arbitrarily, as they supposed, of these endowments. At the time this alleged violation of their constitutional rights was perpetrated, there was on our statute book a law by which the State could be sued, by any of her citizens having a just claim against the State. The colleges supposed they could avail themselves of this law, to bring the matter fairly before the supreme court, and after a long course of fruitless effort, to obtain justice by an appeal to the Legislature, were preparing to adopt the only remedy left them, and institute suit.

The law was then repealed, and the opportunity of contesting the power of the Legislature thereby denied. Subsequently, at a late period, and under the influence of a higher sense of justice and legal obligation, a compromise was effected, and an annual sum granted to the colleges, which was given and accepted expressly as a satisfaction in full, for their very large demands. The terms of the resolution granting the annuity and the acquittance executed by the colleges, would prove this. Such was a brief history of the transactions between the State and these colleges.

A friend near him, [Mr. Randall,] had just offered him the book containing the charter, subscription list, and early proceedings of Washington college, by which it would appear that the contributions toward the establishment of that institution, amounted to ten thousand pounds.

Mr. EGE asked the gentleman to read the resolution.

Mr. CHAMBERS said the resolution was not before him, but he would read what was immediately under his eye. It was the first item on the list of subscribers, and is in the words following:

“His Excellency, George Washington, Esq., General and Commander-in-Chief of the armies of the United States, as an earnest of his goodwill, fifty guineas.”

Mr. EGE said:

That when he asked the gentleman from Kent, to read the resolution to which he had referred,