

Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Schley, Smith, of Worcester, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wooder—51.

*Nays*—Messrs. Belt, Billingsley, Blackiston, Briscoe, Brown, Chambers, Clarke, Dennis, Dent, Duvall, Hollyday, Horsey, Lee, Morgan, Parran, Smith, of Dorchester—16.

The report of the committee on the legislative department was accordingly passed.

#### BASIS OF REPRESENTATION.

On motion of Mr. STOCKBRIDGE, The report of the committee on the basis of representation was taken up and read the third time by its title.

Mr. CUSHING moved that so much be considered the third reading of the report.

Mr. BILLINGSLEY objected.

Mr. CUSHING. I make that motion, and ask that the question be taken.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Will it be in order to adopt that course? Is a matter of such vital interest, embracing a portion of the article on the legislative department, to be taken up and disposed of without having a single section of it read? Are we to have no chance to consider the question of the basis of representation? When gentlemen are sensible that injury is done to my own county by the system, are they to take up the system and drive it through without a word? To us it is a serious affair. The constitution is to operate nominally for all time. It is to effect all classes of people, in a way that cannot be avoided except by calling another convention or some such trouble. If we here are not able to devote half an hour to understanding whether an article that is to be passed, and which has occupied days upon days, and nights, too, I may say, is just to all parts of the State, I protest against such a mode of proceeding. I hope it will not be sanctioned by the convention.

Mr. BRISCOE demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. HEBB. I hope the gentleman will withdraw the motion. It will take as long to call the yeas and nays as to read the report.

Mr. CUSHING. I decline to withdraw it, because if the report is read through there will be motions made to amend, and there will be two votes to be taken upon which the yeas and nays will be called where we shall have one now.

The question being taken, the result was—yeas 13, nays 52—as follows:

*Yeas*—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Audoun, Baker, Barron, Brooks, Cushing, Farrow, Hatch, Hebb, Kennard, McComas, Mullikin, Swope—13.

*Nays*—Messrs. Abbott, Belt, Billingsley, Blackiston, Briscoe, Brown, Chambers, Clarke, Cunningham, Daniel, Davis, of

Washington, Dellinger, Dennis, Dent, Duvall, Earle, Ecker, Galloway, Greene, Hoffman, Hollyday, Hopkins, Hopper, Horsey, Jones, of Cecil, Keefer, King, Larsh, Lee, Markey, Mayhugh, Morgan, Murray, Negley, Parker, Parran, Pugh, Purnell, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Schley, Smith, of Dorchester, Smith, of Worcester, Stirling, Stockbridge, Sykes, Thomas, Todd, Valliant, Wickard, Wooden—52.

When their names were called,

Mr. DANIEL said: As I think it is sometimes absolutely necessary for us to make corrections in these reports, I think they ought to be read through, and I therefore vote "no."

Mr. MAYHUGH said: The people of all parts of the State are interested in this. Besides, I think it is proper and right that all these reports should be read through the third time. There might as well be no such thing as a third reading if all the reports are to be hastily passed through in this manner. Some members might suggest something which requires alteration. It would take no more time to read it than to call the yeas and nays. I vote "no."

The motion was accordingly rejected.

The report was read the third time.

Mr. HOLLYDAY. I move to amend the report so as to give Kent county two representatives instead of one. We are now paying a much larger tax than Caroline county, which has two, and our income tax is much greater. We have a larger number of votes, I think, and still we only have one representative. I think we are entitled to two representatives, and I hope the convention will give us that number.

Mr. SANOS. I would be glad, from the facts which have come to my knowledge since the adoption of this report by the convention upon its second reading, if the convention would consider favorably the amendment made by the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Hollyday.) The county stands now, as our statistics show us, within one hundred or so of being entitled to two representatives in point of population, and as stated by my friend in other matters, in point of property, so far as that has a right to representation, she is rather in advance of some other counties that now have two representatives. I know we have a great many friends in Kent who would esteem it as an act of great injustice if we were to leave them with a single representative.

I am not sure that any county should have less than two, because the sickness or inevitable absence of a single member would always leave the county unrepresented. Especially as the county of Kent approaches so very near the number which would entitle her to two, it may be less than a year, or six months before she will be entitled in point of numbers to two—I would like it if our