

the moneys were derived to make said payments. There is still due to the Treasury proper, for advances made in former years for the payment of bounties, the sum of \$496,483.20.

PENSIONS.

The amount expended under this head, during the fiscal year, was \$49,200, being less than the amount expended during the fiscal year 1872, by the sum of \$7,923.20.

The accompanying tables, from 1 to 13, inclusive, show in detail the various receipts into the Treasury, from all sources during the fiscal year. The receipts from Clerks of Courts, contained in Table No. 1, amounted to \$478,590.98, exceeding the amounts received from similar sources, in 1872, by the sum of \$3,046.78, and being less than those of 1871, by the sum of \$6,276.60. This diminution since 1871, has occurred, notwithstanding the increase of revenue from licenses generally, and is owing entirely to the failure of the law imposing a license tax on sample traders. The amount received from this source, in 1871, was \$44,253.00. The Act, under which this sum was received in 1871, was rendered ineffective by being made to discriminate in the matter of licenses, against residents of other States of the United States—the Constitution of the United States declaring that “the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.”

This discrimination was entirely unnecessary, and an amended Act was presented to the last Legislature, but for some reason failed to become a law. The failure to pass such a law, is in effect a direct discrimination against such of our merchants as keep their stocks of goods within the State and liable to taxation. I can see no reason why a trader who sells for profit by sample, but takes care that his stock of goods shall be kept beyond the taxing power of the State, shall be able to sell without license, when a license tax is required, and penalties are imposed upon the failure to pay it, upon all traders *bona fide* paying taxes on their stocks of goods to the city or county in which they are located, and also to the State, for an equal privilege. In other States, sample merchants, keeping their stocks of goods outside of the State, are required to pay a heavier license tax than those whose stocks of goods are subject to State and city or county taxation, and I can see no possible reason why such should not be the case in this State. I therefore recommend that a license tax be provided by law for all merchants selling by samples, and that a provision be incorporated into the License Laws, requiring all merchants obtaining the ordinary traders' license to declare upon oath, that the stock of goods from which they expect to sell is located within the city or county in