

reading of this report. I think it was intimated by the gentleman from Baltimore city that the proposition offered by my colleague and myself to have representation according to population throughout the State was right; but it was voted down, and the gentleman could not vote for it on the ground that it could not be adopted. The result is that, acknowledging the principle to be right, they will not vote for it, and it cannot be adopted, and they cannot agree upon any proposition. Now is the appointed time for the house to consider—

Mr. CHAMBERS. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest to him that if he will give way I think we may take the vote.

Mr. CLARKE. Very well; I will give way.

Mr. ABBOTT. The gentleman speaks of this as an arbitrary rule. The committee on representation spent a great deal of time over this subject, and came here, so far as the majority are concerned, making a unanimous report. This report has been adopted by the house by a large vote, being based upon a principle.—The only way we can have a republican form of government is to have a representation based upon some firm and fixed principle. There is a provision that a census may be taken by the legislature at any time. Our next legislature can order a census to be taken in the State, and the basis changed or altered in proportion to the number of white inhabitants that they have. I hope that the report will not be opened at all. But if it is to be opened, let the proposition be made at once by every county asking for what it wants, and then let us take one vote upon the whole. If we are going to break the rule at all, we may as well break it all to pieces as to break out one piece at a time.

The same rule holds good now that was good when we acted upon this subject before. I find that Kent county lacks 2,653 of the number for two representatives, which is 10,000. The rule we adopted allows a representative for a fraction equal to one-half the number for a representative, which we fixed upon as a sufficient deviation from the strict rule. Kent county has a white population of 2,347 by the last census over the number required for one member.

Mr. HEBB. That is 153 less than one-half of 5,000.

The PRESIDENT. If she had 154 more, she would be entitled to another representative.

Mr. ABBOTT. The next legislature if they deem it necessary may take a new census of the State; then if the people of Kent have the requisite number they can have a representation according to their population, observing the rule, and have two members. I hope the house will not break the rule unless they intend to give every county, Baltimore county, Frederick county, Howard county, and every county in the State, including Baltimore city, an additional representative.

Mr. MAYHUGH. I trust the report will not be disturbed by increasing the number of members for any county. I was a good deal opposed to the representation allowed to Baltimore city, and the counties generally were opposed to it. But the report being made on principle, I fully concurred in that report.—The gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke) has said that there are calls from all the counties, from every portion of the State in regard to this matter; that it is a violation of justice, and an arbitrary principle, and you might as well go indiscriminately and give so many to each county without any basis at all. If that be the case, then every county will be seeking for amendments, and the city of Baltimore will claim that she has a right to be represented according to population. I appeal to the judgment of any gentleman in this house, whether any report could have been framed upon a more just and equitable principle. The State being a small one, it was necessary to curb the representation of Baltimore city. Otherwise she would have the whole power of the State in her own hands. And in doing so, it has been done upon principles of justice, cutting down the larger counties on the same principle.

Now a gentleman has made a motion to increase the number of members for Kent county. Although I was opposed to the present representation for Baltimore city, yet having agreed to the report and concurred in the principle, I say to vary from it would be sheer injustice. Upon any principle that I could conceive to be right, I was ready to give another representative to Kent; but it would be sheer injustice to Baltimore county and every other county in the State to give it now, because it violates every principle upon which this report is founded; and I conceive we could make no apportionment upon a principle more just to every portion of the State than that of this report. Surely if you award another representative to one county, you must award it to every county, and you must award it to Baltimore city; and if this motion prevails I shall strive with every power I possess to increase our representation.

Mr. STIRLING. The reason I advocate this amendment, is because, as the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Pugh) said, it is no deviation from the principle. It is only a variation of a few hundred, and so near the principle that it amounts actually to the same thing. I do not see why giving this representative to Kent is any reason for giving further representation to the large counties, unless we are to adopt the principle advocated by the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clark) to give to the people of the whole State an absolute representation of one delegate for 5,000 people; and I do not care who gets the power under that basis. If the majority are entitled to the power, nobody pretends to say why a party of people living inside of Baltimore city are not