

He indulged the hope now more than he did in the early stages of the proceedings, that a majority of this Convention would be found favorable to radical changes in the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the Government. There have already been adopted many salutary provisions—among them, restrictions of the most wholesome character, respecting the debt-contracting power, which in times past has been the fruitful source of abuse. The fears of the slave-holding interest have been quieted by a guaranty of constitutional protection; imprisonment for debt abolished, which will guard the honest mechanic and tradesman against the delusive expectation that the fear of imprisonment compels payment of debts, when ninety-nine times in a hundred cases, experience demonstrates that a discharge under the insolvent system robs them of what was due to their toil. By this provision an unfortunate class of sufferers, generally the least culpable, however small in number, are protected from the ignominy of confinement in the common jail.

The sentiment of a vast majority of this body is undoubtedly in favor of an elective judiciary for a term of years; election of clerks and registers by the people, and indeed, almost, if not every single reform promised, will be successfully carried through if this vexed question is satisfactorily settled. Will it not be deeply humiliating if the Reformers, holding the power of effecting so much, should permit this golden opportunity to pass unimproved? He would not speak harshly of the course of any gentleman—it was not his province; but this much he was bound to say, that if the Reform party fail to carry out their views by the disaffection of but a few of their number, heavy would be the responsibility of those who refuse to join the common brotherhood of Reformers.

He was not prepared to yield up all the measures he had enumerated, even if they be properly considered of minor importance, unless representation according to population was obtained. It is conceded on all sides, that a provision for the call of a Convention at stated periods (perhaps every ten years) will be inserted in the new Constitution. That is a great concession, and the means of effecting in the future, reforms for which public sentiment in some sections of the State is not yet ripe.

He had stated that he would vote against the proposed amendment of his colleague (Mr. Brent,) to give twenty four Delegates to the City of Baltimore. Every one would understand his motive, which was to continue to act in concert with the great body of Reformers, from whom alone any increase of the Baltimore Delegation could be obtained. On the side of his friend, he thought would be found not more than three votes. When that proposition was offered, the test would be applied of the sense of this body; and these would be precipitated, but the vote of a portion of the Baltimore Delegation. He could not, for his life, perceive the policy of such a course, though he doubted not the sincerity or uprightness of his colleague's motives. The whole aspect of

such a proceeding wore to him the appearance of a romantic chivalry; he would not say that it was Quixotic. Why, sir, did not his friend well know that of the only four Democrats who voted against Mr. Fiery's proposition, two of them were mainly opposed to it, because of the increase given to the Baltimore Delegation? To resist that amendment or one similar in principle, must end in the total defeat of a Constitution acceptable to the people whom we represent. Are we to turn Ishmaelites and wage war upon every principle of compromise?

Mr. BRENT, of Baltimore, explained. He had over and over again stated that he came there in no spirit to refuse to compromise, but to advocate a compromise upon some fair, just, and honorable principle. He would say that so far as the Senate was concerned, he was willing to adopt a territorial basis, and he thought that was a fair and liberal compromise in reference to representation.

Mr. CHAMBERS conceived that the gentleman (Mr. P.) had done him injustice in classing him among the anti-Reformers. He was no anti-Reformer, being in favor of certain measures of Reform, although he did not advocate all the changes which were proposed.

Mr. PRESSTMAN resumed. He thought he understood his colleague's position. He did not charge him as the opponent of all compromise, but he did understand him as having, early in this body, avowed an unwillingness to compromise upon basis of the House of Delegates, which at least was, practically speaking, the only question upon which a compromise was mooted; the basis of the Senate no one seemed disposed to impeach.

Did not his colleague say that he would not vote for any proposition to increase the representation of the City, unless by a rule which would operate alike throughout the State, or which by the same rule would make any distinction arbitrarily against the City. He was free to say that he did not see much difference between opposing all compromise, and demanding terms, which three-fourths of the whole body would oppose.

As it respects the reiterated avowal of the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) that he was not an anti-Reformer, he could but repeat that which he had before said, that no form of words, no cavil, no splitting of hairs could change the substance of things as seen and judged by candid men.

He (Mr. P.) had before given his definition of a Reformer, which he thought might save any difficulty as to any apprehension of its being applied to the gentleman from Kent, or any of those voting with him on the question of representation. There may be many gentlemen in favor of changes in the Constitution, who do not style themselves, or are they known in this Convention as Reformers, which term embraces in the popular acceptance, no man who is in favor of upholding the present system of representation, or who opposed Conventional Reform? He would now add an example to his definition. The gentleman from Kent, (Mr. CHAMBERS,) had submitted a report to adopt the