

ever adopted, than by mutual surrender of pre-conceived opinions in view of the great end to be accomplished. There were not less than ten or fifteen gentlemen known as reformers in this body, who had voted in favor of the compromise, and who were wholly uncommitted before the vote was cast. The gentleman had said such a caucus was held, and yet he has to admit that he knew nothing of the elements of the consultation or the extent of its obligation, and he founded his suspicion upon the remarks of the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) who had not even used the word "caucus." There is no disposition on my part, since other gentlemen have alluded to the action of the friends of the amendment of the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. Fiery,) to state somewhat more distinctly its origin. That measure had been agreed upon by the friends of compromise and adjustment, as one most likely to secure the favorable consideration of the Convention, and many who had supported it, were bound to adhere to it as long as there was any expectation of passing it. Thus far the consultation on the part of some us might be regarded as partaking of the nature of a caucus. But, sir, there were other gentlemen, and among them the mover of the proposition, (Mr. Fiery,) who had voted for it, who had never been bound by the action of any caucus of any kind or description. The gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) must perceive that he had done injustice, unintentionally no doubt, to the gentleman who moved the amendment, and many who had supported it.

Mr. CHAMBERS said he had not asserted that any member was bound by the caucus. The gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) had complained that the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Brent,) would not conform to the compromise, and he, (Mr. C.,) then stated his opinions with regard to such a caucus.

Mr. PRESSTMAN replied, that because the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) had seen fit to express his regret that his, [Mr. P.'s,] colleague had not voted for the compromise, was indeed but a slight ground for the assertion that a caucus had been held, binding in its operations upon the majority of this Convention, in which assumed state of facts the gentleman had said that he and others might as well retire.

He would ask, what sort of a caucus is that which meets only for consultation, and does not command a majority vote? The whole scope of the gentleman's remarks, had been to bring into disrepute any consultation outside of this Convention, by which harmony of action might be induced, and without some sort of union, no one knows better than the learned gentleman himself, who has warred upon such a movement, that all hope of establishing a basis which will prove acceptable to the people, is vain and idle. Hence these tears!

Would the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) give up one iota of power now held by

the smaller counties? Certainly not. Had not the gentleman from St. Mary's (Mr. Blakistone) who closed his remarks with the emphatic declaration that he would die in his seat before he would yield one inch upon the present basis of representation, and which sentiment had been taken up and echoed around this State, by gentlemen known as anti-reformers? Were there not very many gentlemen pledged in the canvass, to yield nothing to the spirit in which this Convention had been called together. The eloquence of Demosthenes would be of no avail on such minds where reason was not left free to combat with error. He did not use the term anti-reformer, as a term of reproach; the people who elected them as such, honored them in their sentiments, but he could not be brought to believe that in the temper of this Convention, much good would come in any attempt at proselyting. If there are in sincerity a majority of reformers, the compromise must ultimately prevail, if not, the anti-reformers must triumph.

Mr. MITCHELL said the gentleman from Baltimore city was going too far in stigmatising those with whom he, (Mr. M.,) acted as anti-reformers. They were all in favor of some reforms. Did the gentleman mean by an anti-reformer, one who would not give twenty-four representatives to the city of Baltimore?

Mr. PRESSTMAN said that he had expressly stated that he did not use the term anti-reformer, as a stigma. God forbid that he should set himself up "to deal damnation round the land," because of a difference of opinion. He spoke of anti-reformers in the sense in which that term is generally understood throughout the State, in reference to the question of representation. He was happy to know that the gentleman from Kent, [Mr. M.,] was willing to be a reformer of the judiciary.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sir.

Mr. PRESSTMAN. Let me ask if any one in the State would be at a loss to define the position of one of the gentleman from Kent (Mr. Chambers) he surely is not ashamed to be termed an anti-reformer.

Mr. CHAMBERS. If the gentleman will define the term, I will answer yes or no.

Mr. PRESSTMAN. Was the gentleman ashamed to be voted for as an anti-reform candidate for a seat in this Convention?

Mr. CHAMBERS replied that he was not ashamed to be called by any name which would designate the opinions he entertained. He was not a reformer in the sense of desiring a change in the Constitution in all its parts; not in the sense of wanting a judiciary elected for a short term of years, by the people. But in certain particulars, he was in favor of reform. It was but fair that the gentleman should define the term before demanding a categorical reply.

Mr. PRESSTMAN. Are we then indeed all reformers? Is that term grown in high favor, and