

zen, and as individuals are equal to the people of any district, yet it cannot be denied, that men collected in large masses, within a small compass, are less submissive to the just restraints of authority, and more ungovernable, than when dispersed over a large surface. The crowd never reasons, but when operated on by any strong feeling of resentment or desire, it takes counsel from its passions; and is ever liable to become the victim of the arts of demagogues and evil disposed and to be driven headlong to its object over the Constitution the laws and private right. This is the occasional history of all cities. Baltimore, I regret to say, is not an exception. More than once in her history, has the mob triumphed over the law, and sacrificed private property, the works of art, and even human life, to appease its fury. And every year, almost every month, there is some demonstration, more or less strong, that the same lawless spirit still exists, and only requires some strong motive to bring it out, with all its lamentable violence. If such things have been done against the law, what may not be expected when the unrestrained power of making the laws shall be given to a population thus liable to be led away? I repeat, Mr. President, I have no prejudices against the city of Baltimore. I believe the people of that city are as moral, as just, and as patriotic, as the people of any other city, but the facts to which I have referred are undeniable. They are perhaps inseparable from the condition of any people collected in large masses, and they furnish a conclusive reason, if there were no other, why I would be unwilling to trust them with the measure of political power which is claimed, and which, in the present condition of Maryland, would be an unlimited power to control the legislation of the State.

But there are still other reasons, which are conclusive with me in denying her the power she claims. She is the market, both of purchase and sale, for the whole State, and must continue to be, and it would be exceedingly unwise and likely to lead to the worst consequences, if she were invested with power to make the laws regulating trade in that city. That feeling of self interest which actuates all men and all bodies, would prompt her to frame these laws, to suit her own interests. Who doubts that such laws would be prejudicial to the counties? Why, sir, with the limited authority she has heretofore had, there has been a constant conflict between the city and other portions of the State, as to legislation of this description. And that conflict admonishes us of the impolicy of investing her with unrestrained power over the subject. She would frame those laws for her own advantage, and her gain would be our loss. She is also rapidly extending her commerce beyond the limits of the State—she is exerting all her energies to attract to her market the trade of the neighboring States and especially of the West, which is all right and commendable; but when secure of political power, is there no danger that she will court favors and seek attachments beyond the limits of the State, which may be prejudicial to us?

Looking, Mr. President, at the present and prospective condition of that city, her popula-

tion, her relations to other portions of the State, her trade within and without the State, and her desire to extend her commercial connections—while I concede to her people purity and patriotism equal to our own, and not more selfishness than is to be found elsewhere, I am not willing to trust her with the control of the State. I am not influenced by any feeling of unkindness to that city. I am proud of her rapid increase in wealth and population—I am proud of her patriotism—her enterprise—her renown—her monuments. I hope she will travel on, for long time to come, with accelerated pace, in the pathway of prosperity, but I am not willing to trust her altogether to herself, much less to give her control over the whole State? And sir, is there any thing wrong or unjust in this? Is she not a child of the State and the object of its bounty? Has she not been built up by its fostering care? Is she not indebted for her present position to the beneficence of the State? Is not her wealth, in a great degree, made up of contributions from the counties? Have not the people of the whole State been taxed to open new channels through which might flow into her lap, the commerce of surrounding States? Is she not, in truth, the grand depository of the wealth of the State? And is it any thing very strange, or very improper, that the State should be unwilling to yield her authority to her creature, and abandon herself to its control?

Mr. President Baltimore city, even with a delegation no larger than that of the largest county, has exercised an influence over the legislation of the State, at least five times greater than that of any county. Has there been a single measure she has desired, save the increase of her delegation, which she has not ultimately carried? Was it not her influence exerted on the Legislature, which commenced the vast schemes of internal improvement, and plunged the State in the enormous debt, which now hangs over us? Gentlemen tell us that the particular works which have been constructed for her benefit are profitable, and have made ample returns to the treasury.

But is this so? Were not the Susquehanna rail road and tide water canal emphatically Baltimore works, and are they not both largely in arrear? Both have failed to pay the interest on the advances made for their construction, and are now indebted to the State over one million of dollars on this account. And will it be pretended that the appropriations for the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal made by the three millions bill, and eight millions bill, were not made by the influence and aid of Baltimore city? And do not these manifestations of her power, exercised through her limited representation, warn us against the increase she now asks? If these things are done in the green tree, what may we not expect in the dry?

We are warned too against increasing the power of Baltimore city by the threats which we have heard from that quarter. We were told a day or two ago by the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Brent,) that we had better agree to her demands, or she would take in the House and