

port would be final. The legislature can have no desire or reason for imposing upon a county a tax which is not needed, and which must have been imposed only at the request of the counties. There is not an instance in which the legislature has forced a county to collect a school tax which has not been asked for by the county itself. The counties have from time to time represented that the assessment was insufficient, and have come to the legislature with the request that the county commissioners be empowered to increase the tax, and the legislature have granted it. If they should hereafter come to the legislature again and tell them that by general laws there has been provided a sufficient tax; that taking as they did the whole taxable property of the State and getting their proportion raised from the taxable property in the State, there is no further necessity for taxing these individual counties. There is no doubt that the legislature will grant the power to discontinue these taxes, exactly as they have heretofore granted the power to assess them.

Look at the question of taxation fairly, and do not ignore the fact that the counties pay ten, twelve, fifteen, and twenty cents on the \$100; and because it is proposed to collect it in a different channel fly off into the idea that your taxes are increased, when under this report you will be paying twenty cents only, and heretofore the average has been in nine counties 21 7-9 cents on the \$100. The average taxation in the counties will be exactly 1 7-9 cents on the \$100 less under the operation of the report than they have hitherto been.

For the same reason that I thought the gentleman's argument unfair last night, I thought it unfair this morning, because it ignores the fact of paying two taxes, and he does not see that it costs as much to pay ten cents to the State and fifteen cents to the county on the \$100 as to pay twenty cents to the State directly. I do not see that I save the five cents by paying it from my pocket to a different set of assessors. It is certainly surprising that there should be found representatives of counties believing this. The report throws into this school taxation the whole taxable property of the State. It makes the educational tax equal throughout the State, instead of what it has hitherto been in many of the counties, a very unequal burden, as you will see by the schedule given by the gentleman from Anne Arundel (Mr. Miller) himself. The gentleman last night told us that it was now proposed to add ten cents to the \$100. Either ignorantly or otherwise the gentleman overlooked the fact that the last ten cents put on were destroyed when the bonds forming the sinking fund were burnt at the treasury office.

Mr. MILLER. I say that it increases the present tax.

Mr. CUSHING. The present tax not having

been paid; it does not increase the tax paid last year.

Mr. MILLER. I paid mine. I do not know whether the gentleman has paid his or not.

Mr. CUSHING. The gentleman's argument is not fair; because if the taxation is really less, why does he call it excessive? He comes in here and talks to us about the excessive tax under which the State will groan, and it seems that he is comparing it with the diminished tax. We have a right to compare it with the old tax. The argument is not a fair one any way that you look at it. It is an argument which if entertained would lead to the destruction of every interest in the State. When he attempts to complicate the question of public school education in this State by reference to your judiciary, and subsequently endeavors to kill the judiciary system by reference to what you have established in your common school system, it does not show a strong desire for a good constitution for this State. It shows what I maintained last night that the preference is for no change in the constitution, a desire to destroy what will make this constitution a good one and acceptable to the people of the State. The gentleman's own figures tell against him in every respect, as to what the counties have paid; for the gentleman told us the part paid to the counties and ignored the part paid to the State direct.

But there are some merits in the question itself. There comes the great question to intelligent men, whether upon the gentleman's own theory of the cost the education of the State would not be worth the money. The gentleman makes a specious argument drawn from a particular State where a school system has worked for many years, and all the hard points of the system have been rubbed off, and where all the expense of starting a system has been gotten rid off—and without going into the statistics of that statement, without knowing anything about the amount of taxation, he assumes to instruct us as to what their system has cost. With 249,220 minors in your State between five and twenty years of age, this convention has of itself sense sufficient to know, whether probably two hundred and fifty or three hundred thousand dollars per annum is more than enough for their education. You would suppose the gentleman would be found an advocate for education, but the whole tone of his argument has been against it altogether. You had better have no system at all than a system so bad that it will not be supported or that it will make no fitting return for the outlay. It is the old Judas cry—selling the Lord for thirty pieces; it is putting a mere petty amount of silver against a great interest—only in the argument of the gentleman, (Mr. Miller)—not fairly weighing the silver against the good that is to come, but ignor-