

were no rules without exceptions; that the exceptions proved the value of the rule. But they are now agreed to act in this matter as if there was but one single exception, and that was on their side, and that there was no other to counterbalance it. I say it is but just to Baltimore county that she should have this additional member.

Gentlemen talk about the increase of population in Kent county since 1860. Do not they suppose that the larger, populous and rapidly growing county of Baltimore has increased its thousands also since then? To be sure it has, and gentlemen must know it as well as I do. They can in their calculations and arguments make allowance for the growth of the little county of Kent, and can assert that they have no doubt in the world that she has a number of people that did not appear upon the face of the census table of 1860, and then they shut their eyes most persistently to the fact that Baltimore county, from her position, size, population, and everything that goes to favor an increase, must have increased at least ten to one to what Kent has.

Now let gentleman act consistently in this matter. Let them either bind themselves down to a rule and adhere to it, and say—"I take what is nominated in the bond; I ask no more;" or if they vary from the rule let them be as consistent about it as they can.—Do not come to the conclusion that Kent has more inhabitants than appear upon the census, and then when you come to the case of Baltimore county, utterly ignore the fact that her increase must have been at least ten for every one that Kent has increased.

There have always been a class of politicians in the country who have been ready to raise some cry whenever there is a popular election. There is always some catchword invented to be thrown out among the people to confuse and mislead them. The gentleman could not serve our people that way. He might come among them and raise thocry of "representation according to population," and then if he asked them for their votes, they would tell him they had not yet advanced quite that far in their political education. I am sure the cry raised in Baltimore county would not benefit him or his party, when it was known that they had here to day refused Baltimore county her moral and political right.

We have, as far as we can, to adopt some rule, as we have a large city, with more than one-third of the population of the State in it, we have to adopt some rule which is progressive in regard to this matter of representation. But when you come to a county situated as Baltimore county is, with 40,000 and more inhabitants to-day, you cannot tie her down arbitrarily to an iron rule, in the face of all her strength, wealth, population and intelligence. That would work her great harm. Still gentleman cry—"It is so nominated in the bond." But when it comes to Kent county, or some

other little place whose political sympathies are different from those of Baltimore county, then the rule is a withe of straw, and will go by the board.

Now I hope the Union men of this house will not do Baltimore county the injustice, after first saying that Kent county shall be benefited outside the rule, then tying Baltimore county down to the rule. I trust they will not so far forget their duty to themselves, to Baltimore county, and to the majority of the people of the State who sent them here, as to give up their rule when it works against them, and refuse to relax it when it will work in their favor.

Mr. STIRLING moved the previous question, which was seconded.

The question was then taken upon ordering the main question, and upon a division—ayes 37, noes not counted—the main question was ordered.

Mr. BRISCON moved a call of the house, which was ordered.

Pending the call of the roll,
On motion of Mr. CUSHING,
Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The question recurred upon the motion of Mr. THOMAS, to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of Mr. HOLLYDAY was adopted, giving Kent county two delegates instead of one.

Upon this question Mr. ABBOTT called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The question was then taken, by yeas and nays, and resulted—yeas 30, nays 35—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Audoun, Baker, Barron, Cunningham, Cushing, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Ecker, Farrow, Galloway, Hebb, Hoffman, Keefer, King, Larsh, Mayhugh, McComas, Murray, Negley, Parker, Ridgely, Russell, Sands, Schley, Thomas, Wickard, Wooden—30.

Nays—Messrs. Belt, Billingsley, Blackiston, Bond, Briscoe, Brown, Carter, Chambers, Clarke, Daniel, Dent, Drywall, Earle, Greene, Hollyday, Hopkins, Hopper, Horsey, Kennard, Lee, Markey, Miller, Mullikin, Nyman, Parran, Pugh, Purnell, Scott, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Worcester, Stirling, Stockbridge, Swope, Sykes, Todd—35.

The motion to reconsider was accordingly not agreed to.

Pending the call of the roll, the following explanations were made by members, as their names were called.

Mr. CHAMBERS. Gentlemen assert here that a compromise was proposed by which Kent county was to obtain an additional member. The import of the statement would naturally be that Kent county had compromised herself on that subject to some extent. There does not seem to be a shadow of foundation for such a thing. I demand of gentlemen to say