

that claiming simply *equality*? How now about the school fund. Have we not claimed that a free white child in Baltimore is as much to be educated out of the treasury, as if the child resided in Calvert or Caroline? We only contended for an equitable distribution of the school fund; we claimed equity and equality out of the common treasury.

The gentleman says, in the name of liberty, in the name of equality, how many crimes are committed, and that if it were not for demagogues, if the people were let alone, they would be perfectly quiet and reconciled. Upon the same argument, he might induce people who were subjects of a despot to remain quiet and submit to a happy and beneficial condition. Whether the people are oppressed or not, if I have not equal rights, I will contend to the last drop of my blood, if necessary, upon the abstract principle of equality, and no denunciation of demagogues, or rebukes for attempting to raise the banner of equal rights will ever deter me, and I hope will never deter any one from carrying that banner until triumph shall perch upon it. The gentleman says, that we desired a general ticket for the election of judges of the Court of Appeals. Why not have a general ticket, why was there so meagre a vote for it? Owing to the eloquence of the gentlemen, who rise up here and cry out, "party." In what State is the Court of Appeals elected, unless by general ticket? In every State of the Union, except Kentucky where the Court of Appeals is elected by the people, *it is done by general ticket*. Is there not a principle that when the judges of the Court of Appeals are judges over the whole State, that they should be elected by general ticket? Ah! but the tremendous power of Baltimore city must be guarded against, or they might elect a court upon this Democratic principle. Why did the gentleman vote to elect the clerks of the counties by the people, and yet vote against the election of the clerks of the Court of Appeals by the people? No! that clerk must be appointed by the judges of the Court of Appeals? The just principle established by this Constitution, that the judges, clerks and registers shall be elected by the people must be thwarted when we come to the high and dignified office of the clerk of the Court of Appeals. Why is this? Because, if the general ticket shall be adopted, the vote of Baltimore city might elect that officer. I ask the gentleman to reconcile these things, and give some reason for their occurrence. I cannot account for it, except by referring it to the hatred, jealousy and distrust of Baltimore city.

Mr. SOLLERS, by unanimous consent, rose to reply to the remarks of Mr. BRENT, and said:—I have but few observations to make. The gentleman charges me with having spoken disrespectfully and harshly of Baltimore city.

Mr. BRENT. I did not. I have not charged the gentleman as speaking disrespectfully and harshly of Baltimore city. I say that the head and front of her offence is, that she has contended for equality and equity.

Mr. SOLLERS. That is the issue. Will the

gentleman tell me what he means by equality? Will he answer me what he means by equal representation? Did his colleagues agree with him in the position he assumed here?

Mr. BRENT. All of them. They voted for representation based upon population.

Mr. SOLLERS. I ought not to say any thing upon that subject, for it was merely a quarrel between the delegation from Baltimore city. It was a most memorable one, and I shall not forget it! But I have not said one word against Baltimore city. I would not care if it were blotted out from the map of Maryland. So help me heaven, I say so. I do not understand, nor can I comprehend, these magnificent eulogies passed upon Baltimore city. It is Baltimore city, "Baltimore city"—this is the cry from one day to another. I do not know why she deserves these enormous compliments constantly paid her here. I know she is the great absorber of all the wealth and of all the labor of Maryland. There is no man, woman or child, in the State, but does not contribute to it by the sweat of his brow. What have we done for Baltimore city? In 1835, we agreed to pour out, in the form of taxes, our very heart's blood to sustain the great commercial interests of that city. Tell me, if you can, what interest, what advantage, have we gained from the enormous appropriations made for works of internal improvements, and solely for the benefit of the city of Baltimore. Answer me that question honestly. And when the tax-gatherer comes around, and wrings from us our hard earnings, we are building up palaces as high as high heaven, for the benefit of the aristocratic gentlemen of Baltimore city. These are truths. They say that they pay half the taxes of the State. I deny it. They do not pay one dollar, and I can demonstrate it to any sensible man. Every single dollar they have appropriated for works of internal improvement and their commercial interest and prosperity, has been trebled, more than trebled; and what did it? The works of internal improvement. Who paid for them? We. What have we received? Nothing. The productions of the western country are brought into competition with our earnings, and all for Baltimore city!

This tremendous absorber appropriates to itself the whole wealth, energy, labor, and productive interests of the State, and yet if we say any thing against Baltimore city, we are to be answered that the spirit of fire—to which the gentleman alluded—

Mr. BRENT. When did I use that expression?

Mr. SOLLERS. Some beautiful quotation which the gentleman used, but which I have forgotten. I thought he alluded to the Baltimore battalion. I was certain he had them in his mind. [Laughter.] Can we do nothing, say nothing to defend ourselves, unless we are charged with injuring Baltimore city? Let us alone—let us stay where our fathers put us. We ask nothing. We sometimes ask bank accommodations, and get them too. [Laughter.]