

Mr. BAISCOX. It is very likely that the matter may have to be changed again. I have a motion to make.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I will give way for the present.

Mr. BAISCOX. I move to suspend the 53d rule to enable me to move to strike out "one" after Calvert, Charles and St. Mary's, and to insert the word "two" in each place, so as to give each county of the State two delegates at least. I was somewhat surprised a few moments ago to hear the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Thomas) say that there had been an outside understanding that this thing, so far as the increase for the county of Baltimore was concerned, was to be considered.

The PRESIDENT. The motion to suspend is not debatable.

Mr. BAISCOX. I will move to add one to Baltimore county at the same time.

The motion to suspend the 53d rule was rejected.

#### KENT COUNTY

Mr. THOMAS moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment submitted by Mr. HOLLYDAY to increase the representation of Kent county was adopted.

Mr. HOLLYDAY. I hope that motion will not prevail. The gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Thomas) stated that there had been a promise made if another representative was given to Kent, to give another one to Baltimore county. I should like to know from whom that promise came; for I have not understood that there was such a promise.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman that I thought it was generally understood. I would not have come up to the house this afternoon, sick as I am, if I did not think from what I heard outside of this house that Baltimore county was to have one more delegate. I told the gentleman at dinner I would be here.

Mr. HOLLYDAY. I can only say with regard to that matter that I never promised anybody. I told them I had no objection at all to giving one to Baltimore county; but I never said that I would vote for it. I am one of those who never make an arrangement of that kind. I told them that I would not bind myself to vote for Baltimore county or any other county.

Mr. CHAMBERS. In explanation of my position I solemnly protest that I not only never heard of the compromise, but never heard that it was designed to move; if Kent obtained a member, that Baltimore county should have another, until I heard it from gentlemen upon this floor since the vote was taken.

Mr. BARBOUR. I will state that this morning it was mentioned that Kent wanted a member, and Baltimore county a member, and I said: put them both together and I will vote

for them. I was willing to vote for Baltimore county every day in the week; but I saw that as soon as they got the member for Kent, they were satisfied to go back.

Mr. CLARKE. This is a motion to reconsider, and I regard it now in order in debating the matter, whether or not we should reconsider the vote, to call the attention of the convention to the difference of the ground upon which Kent county appealed to the convention, and that upon which Baltimore county has appealed to the convention. I will state, as I stated before, that I voted this morning at first against the increase to Kent county upon the ground that the convention having determined upon an arbitrary rule by which representation should be apportioned in the State, the basis of that rule should be applied and carried out to its consequences, and that there should be no departure from it for the purpose of conciliating anywhere any local feeling, or any local dissatisfaction; because, after the principle was adopted it must work equally everywhere if that was to be the rule of representation.

I stated further, as a reason for my subsequent vote upon the proposition to increase the delegation from Kent county, and as a reason for my vote in opposition to the increase of the delegation from Baltimore county in order to reconcile the two votes, that I did it simply upon this ground; that I had heard it stated by gentlemen in whose word I placed implicit confidence, upon this floor, that Kent county possessed a white population which entitled her to two members. The gentleman from Cecil said he knew that the population of Kent since 1860 had largely increased, and by the census of 1860 Kent county only wanted about one hundred and fifty additional white population to entitle her to another member. And other gentlemen stated positively that they were sure that if the population of Kent county were now to be taken, she would have a population which would entitle her to two representatives.

Now the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) inquires whether I, as a lawyer, would take hear-say evidence. I do not take hear-say evidence at all. That was not a hear-say state of evidence. It was the testimony of honorable gentlemen upon this floor, asserting from their knowledge of the fact that she was entitled to this representation. And I would ask him, or any gentleman upon this floor, if honorable members here make an assertion, acting under their oaths, and their duties to the State of Maryland, other members have not a right to act upon it. That fixes my vote for Kent county. Now I will come to Baltimore county.

Baltimore county had under this apportionment five members, one for each five thousand white inhabitants, up to twenty-five thousand. Then the convention say that