

friends would give this matter a liberal consideration, and vote accordingly. It cannot do any harm to the State for one more or less member to sit upon this floor, and it might do good to us. It certainly, I think, would do scarcely less than justice to that county. If she were hundreds or thousands away from the quota, I would not be an advocate of the change, but would say, let her wait.

Mr. DENNIS. You say "it might do good to us." Whom do you mean by "us?"

Mr. SANDS. The people of the State, of whom I am one. That is what I mean by "us," speaking collectively. It cannot do any harm to the people of the State of Maryland to vote an additional member to these people when their population so nearly approaches the proper number. I think they can well appeal to the majority of this house, and that we ought to listen to that appeal. I know we have large numbers of friends in Kent county who would be greatly disappointed and much embittered if something is not done in this matter. Both as a matter of justice and of policy I would like to see our friends adopt it. As I said, it can do us, meaning the people of the State, no harm to give an additional member here, and it may be doing simple justice. I hope the motion will prevail.

Mr. TODD. I was myself on the point of making the same motion made by the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Hollyday.) For the reasons that have been very well expressed by the gentleman from Howard (Mr. Sands,) I hope this convention will reconsider its action and give Kent county two representatives.

Mr. BILLINGSLEY. I shall make the same motion for St. Mary's county. I was not here when the basis of representation was established, but there is one fact which I think has escaped the consideration of this body that ought to make a very deep impression upon them in regard to this matter. It is that St. Mary's county is the mother of all the counties; that it was there that religious liberty was first inaugurated, and that it is due to her position as the mother of the counties, and as having inaugurated civil and religious liberty, if she has not the numbers under this ratio to entitle her to an additional representative; and I therefore hope the convention will be liberal enough to give us one more representative.

Mr. STIRLING. I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Hollyday.) After considerable reflection, I have become convinced that it is wise and politic to do so. I think in fact it is only 150 short; and that her voting population is even larger than that of Caroline, which has two representatives. That is the reason why I will make this exception. But I cannot accede to the request of my friend who sits behind me, (Mr. Billingsley,) because upon the

principle we have established St. Mary's county, if allowed two representatives, will be in an unequal position, even as compared with Kent; for it will be giving Kent county with a population of 10,000 two representatives, and St. Mary's the same number with a population of about 5,000. Certainly there is no justice in this. Kent county has nearly enough for two representatives.

Mr. BILLINGSLEY. I think that the fact which the honorable gentleman has stated should be to this convention an additional consideration for giving us what we claim. By whom have we lost our property?

Mr. STIRLING. I referred to the free population.

Mr. NEGLEY. I hope the house will not disturb the principle adopted in this report. If you open it at all in one instance, and deviate from the vital principle upon which it was established, you will be asked to open it in others; and if you open it in one instance, I say there is no reason why we should not open it in others. There is great complaint by our friends from Baltimore county, that the report operates unjustly upon them; and they have an equal right with Kent and St. Mary's to come here and ask that they have one additional member. You will open this entirely. You will destroy its symmetry. You will destroy the very fundamental principle upon which the apportionment is made.

Have the people of Kent county a right to complain? Is it not made a principle that every 5,000 white persons or fraction thereof over one-half shall be entitled to one representative? This is a principle that operates upon all the counties alike; and if you disturb it at all, you disturb the whole entire principle. It is like knocking away the foundations upon which a superstructure is built. The whole thing topples to the ground. If you violate the principle in this solitary instance, it destroys the validity of the rule *in toto*. There is no sense or reason in it. Baltimore county has a better right to come forward and ask for two additional representatives than Kent or St. Mary's for one. The provision is made that as soon as a county has a fractional part over the half of 5,000, she may go before the legislature and ask an enumeration of the State, and get her additional representative. All the small counties can do so.

It will be departing from the principle; and if you open the report in this one instance, you will have applications from other counties. You will destroy the whole report, and be at sea again; and perhaps it will take days and days before it is finally settled. If you open this report at all to give Kent county one more, I shall claim, and I shall vote to give Baltimore county one or two additional representatives, and Frederick county, too, and for my own county I shall put in a claim.