

Mr. DANIEL. There is no rule without its exceptions. It is said that the exceptions are necessary to constitute the rule. Now I think this is such a slight exception to the rule, and I think the equity of the case and the circumstances appeal to us so strongly to deviate from the strict rule we have made in this matter, that I shall vote very cheerfully for opening the report to allow this additional representative to be given to Kent county. As it has already been said, not only in point of population, they are so near, but they are ahead of a good many other counties that have additional representation, in point of wealth and other circumstances.

Mr. NEGLEY. Wealth is not the basis of representation.

Mr. DANIEL continued: As to the objection raised by the gentleman from Washington, that if we open this, the whole structure topples, and we must necessarily open it, and necessarily amend it for everybody who asks it, I cannot see the force of the reasoning. But I say to him that we will judge of every case upon its own merits. When the appeal comes from St. Mary's or Baltimore county, if they apply, we will judge of each case upon its own merits, taking up one at a time, and judge of it upon its own merits. I am for opening the report and granting an additional member; and when the other cases come up, if other applications shall be made, I will judge of those. I am free to say that the application of St. Mary's I shall not vote for, and I shall vote against every other that has not stronger claims than St. Mary's; but this having a great deal stronger claim, I shall vote for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. Negley) has referred to the claims of Baltimore county. Our people are complaining very bitterly that, with a population twice that of Carroll county, we have only one additional representative. I hope this will be opened, and that the gentleman from Kent will be allowed one more, and that Baltimore county will get one or two more.

Mr. PUGH. I have only to say that the reason why I shall vote for giving to Kent an additional representative is that I do not think that, in point of fact, the principle is violated by our doing so. I think, in point of fact, that the language used in this section would be applicable to the county of Kent. Although we confined the number to one, upon the census of 1860, yet I think that, in point of fact, Kent is to-day entitled to two representatives, because I think that there are to-day far more than this small fraction of white people that are required in order to entitle the county to two.

But with regard to Baltimore county, I do not believe that, according to the principle adopted, Baltimore county is entitled to additional representatives; nor do I believe any

other county is entitled to more than we have allowed it. I certainly intend to support the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kent, for the reason that I now state, that I believe that that particular county is to-day, on account of the white people that are in the county, entitled to two representatives. It is a peculiar case, unlike the case of any other county. She only lacks a very few by the census, and, as I have said before, I believe the principle applied to the number as it exists there to-day, would give to Kent county an additional representative.

Mr. CLARKE. I merely rise to say that upon the pending proposition I shall vote with pleasure to increase the representation of Kent county to two members. And I will say that if a similar proposition is offered to increase the representation of the other counties cut down to one member, I shall vote for such an amendment to the present report; and, to a great extent, upon this ground, that by cutting down any of the counties to one member, having only one senator, in the event of the sickness or necessary absence of the member during that session of the legislature, you must necessarily have, even upon the floor of this house, a county without any representation whatever.

I think it further necessary to make one allusion to the question of principle being involved in the adoption of the amendment. Gentlemen forget that there is no principle involved in it at all. We see to-day that we hear complaints from Washington county; we hear complaints from Baltimore county; we hear complaints from Kent; we hear them from all parts of the State. And why? Because in the adoption of this representative system you have not gone upon principle; but have merely adopted the arbitrary rule that for every 5,000, to a certain extent, you will give one member; and then you go on according to a certain other rule, changing the rule with the increase of population. If it was principle involved in this case, the principle would work right and justice everywhere, and give satisfaction to every portion of the State. You have just as much right to say you will give one member for every 3,000 as for every 5,000 or 10,000. It is a mere arbitrary standard; a rule which you choose to adopt; and no principle is involved; and hence the result is complaint from every side.

Now I say that there being no principle involved in the case, but only an arbitrary rule, I go for extending this arbitrary rule further, and giving to every county of the State at least two members upon this floor; so that the small counties shall not be left during a great portion of the time without representation.

One other remark I wish to make upon this question. I was not here when the vote was taken upon this question upon the second