

opinion adverse to the passage of that supplement—a promise which I most *guardedly* kept.

I will now advert to the proceedings on the following amendments proposed to said supplement, upon its second reading in the House of Delegates, as they supply additional features in the contrast aforementioned.

*First.* On the motion of Mr. Moores, of Harford county, said bill was amended on the 13th of February, 1834, (see folio 285, House Journal 1833,) by adding the following section:

‘SEC. 7. *And be it enacted,* That this act shall be in force until the year 1845, and no longer.

*Secondly.* On motion of Mr. Fassett, of Worcester county, made on the 21st day of February, 1834, (see same vol., folio 347,) ‘to strike out said seventh section,’ it was resolved in the affirmative—and Mr. Moores having called for the yeas and nays, they were recorded; and it appears that Mr. Pratt voted in the affirmative.

The perpetuity of the charter being thus once more provided for, I should note that on the same day, (see same vol., folio 347,) Mr. Pratt himself proposed that the tax specified by the 5th and 6th sections of said supplements, for the establishment of free schools, should be paid to the State *until the year 1845*; and after 1845 such a bonus as the legislature may at that time impose on the other banks of this State—a bonus as difficult to define as it would be to enforce, because the legislature could not then, or thereafter impose any bonus on the bank of Maryland, one of the banks of this State, its charter being perpetual too. And if this difficulty were insuperable, the Bank of Columbia, had said supplement become a law, would, like the Bank of Maryland have been, after 1845 exempt from the school tax, and also from any charge of bonus, as the school tax provided for by said supplement, according to the amendment made on Mr. Pratt’s motion, was to be paid to the State only *until the year 1845*.

The bill was then passed in this liberal form by the House of Delegates, and sent to the Senate, there referred to a committee, reported favorably on by Wm. T. Wotton, from said committee, on the 3d of March, 1834, (see Senate Journal of 1833, folio 275,) considered on the 14th day of the same month, (see folio 380,) again, on the 15th day of the same month, when it was rejected, (see folio 405 of the same vol.)

Recollecting, as I did, in February, 1835, the liberal views that guided Mr. Pratt’s action in the year 1834, with reference to the duration of the charter of the Bank of Columbia, the school tax on its capital, as well as the bonus for its franchise, I was I repeat it, much surprised to hear, as I did with great regret, because Mr. Pratt was by the petitioners attending at Annapolis to solicit the charter of the Merchants’ Bank of Baltimore, regarded as the friend of their application, that he had proposed to limit the term of said charter to the year 1845, and had also voted for Mr. Teakle’s