

jerity, and the levying of a tax when the debt was contracted, would be a sufficient security. The gentleman from Cecil objected to the restriction of the power of appropriating public money for private and local purposes, because it was in effect an admission that the power now existed in the Legislature to make such appropriations. After this power had been exercised for so many years by the Legislature, and acquiesced in by the people, it was too late to say that a clause to regulate and restrict its application conferred the power. To illustrate this point, Mr. G. made references to various appropriations which had been made, at different periods, for private and local purposes. He, (Mr. G.,) had objected to the provision in the amendment of the gentleman from Cecil, authorizing appropriations for the necessary expenditures of the Government. He had made that objection because these expenditures were not sufficiently defined by the word "necessary." The courts had decided that the word admitted of a larger latitude of construction than he was willing to permit, embracing such expenditures as were for convenient purposes. Under such an interpretation as this, the Legislature might consider themselves empowered to appropriate money to any amount they might think fit, for such expenses of State as they might determine to be necessary. He had no great objection to granting this power, provided the objects for which the appropriations were to be made should be clearly specified so as to guard against any abuse. The gentleman from Cecil objected further to the proposition of his friend and colleague, [Mr. George,] that there was no safety in voting for the last branch of it, although he indicated a willingness to do so, because the first part of the proposition might not afterwards be adopted; and he desired that the two branches should be taken together. And in consequence of these objections, the gentleman from Cecil had thrown all his great powers into the scale against the proposition.

CREDIT OF THE STATE.

*Remarks of Mr. GRASON, March 5, 1851, on the amendment of Mr. GEORGE.*

Mr. GRASON said:

That if the proposition of his colleague could be fairly interpreted as it had been, by the gentleman from Prince George's, [Mr. Bowie,] it would present a serious objection to its adoption, because its effect would be to prevent the payment of any just and proper claim against the State. But he did not think it could be properly susceptible of such interpretation. The intention of the amendment of his colleague was to prevent the Legislature from loaning the public money or the public credit for the use of individuals or associations, but not that the Legislature should not have the power to pay any just debts due to individuals. He was neither a lawyer nor a judge, but to him it appeared quite clear that the amendment could have no such effect. The gentleman from Prince George's said it would prevent any appropriations for hospitals and universities. The universities stood on a different

foundation, and would not be touched by the amendment. And as to the various hospitals which have sprung up in the city of Baltimore, he would like to be informed how they became State institutions. He did not know the amendment of his colleague would prevent any further appropriations for them. But if it would, he had no objection. The amendment suggested by the gentleman from Prince George's would let in a number of claimants on the Treasury. Internal improvement companies might bring in a number of claims. The proposition of his colleague would not prevent the Legislature from redeeming the pledged faith of the State; and he would go against the adoption of any amendment of doubtful construction. The people had decided against any more internal improvements by the State. Wherever lateral roads are necessary they can be constructed by capitalists and others who have an interest in making them.

*Remarks of Mr. GRASON, March 6, 1851, on the amendment of Mr. DAVIS, in relation to appropriations for purposes of Education.*

Mr. GRASON had only a few words to say in reply to the gentleman from Montgomery, [Mr. Davis.] He did not desire to be understood as occupying a position opposed to some plan of education; but he was opposed to taxing the people for the purpose of creating an expensive system, or for establishing or extending corporations for the purpose. But the gentleman from Montgomery was mistaken as to the meaning of the proposition of his friend and colleague. What are the words of the amendment?

Here Mr. Grason read the amendment.

It was not intended to prohibit the Legislature from establishing a plan of education. He knew that the subject would come up in a report from the committee on Education. His colleague had no more idea of preventing an appropriation for education, than for training the militia, or any other indispensable object. It was intended to restrict the Legislature, so as to prevent the appropriation of money for the use of corporations, associations or individuals, but not to prevent the education of the children in the State. But how did the amendment of his colleague read, after the amendment of the gentleman from Montgomery was attached to it? It then not only empowers, but actually invites the Legislature to create corporations for the establishment of a great system of education. Although he entirely agreed in the great principle laid down by the gentleman from Montgomery, he was directly opposed to, and indeed he did not know that the gentleman intended his proposition to have that effect, the creation of these corporations. We have now two colleges in the State; and with these he would not interfere; but he would never vote for establishing nor extending corporations for the purpose of building up an extravagant system, and he would vote against it now. Not, he repeated, that he was opposed to the principle, and he would go with the gentleman from Montgomery in the adoption of any general mea-