

venerable Constitution, to oust us of the benefits we have so long held under it. The great body of the people are the jury—our arguments here, *pro and con*, ought to be presented to them, intelligibly, so as to enable them to give a true verdict. The people cannot decide as they should, if they have not all the information they can get. Let them have it, and the cost necessary to furnish it is well expended. Demand and supply must regulate prices sir, such is the law of trade and commerce, everywhere, in all things. My friend, (Mr. Thawley.) is a farmer. It may cost him some fifty, sixty or seventy dollars to hire a hand for the year. He has a fine season and makes an uncommonly large and abundant crop. His neighbors and the country generally are less fortunate, and the aggregate amount produced in the country, is much below the usual quantity. Corn, in consequence, is at a much higher price, say two, three prices, but his cost him no more to raise it, than in ordinary years, and he would make a fair profit, by selling it at one-third the price it will command. Does he, therefore, charge less when he sends it to his commission merchant for sale? I rather guess he expects him "to do the best he can." Amongst the large volumes of reports, which constitute what we call history and biography, we have some inkling of the most strange things that have occurred from the days of Adam, down to this memorable Convention, (a laugh.) But, sir, there is no where mention made, of a reporter who died rich, having acquired his wealth by his profession, and unless times change there never will. Conventions will probably go out of fashion again, and then the occasion for their services will be greatly diminished. We are instructed, that "the laborer is worthy of his hire;" surely it ought to be sufficient to support him. Here we are, at a stand still. If there be any fault—and I do not admit there is—we are all in "*pari delicto*"—let every man bear his own sins—at all events, don't make the reporter the scape-goat. I have no fear of censure from the people. Of course grumblers will growl; so they will in any event. But with few exceptions, they would rather censure us for arresting the only source of information they have. The debates must be published, the reporter cannot have them published unless means are furnished him, and the only question then is, as to compensation. He is willing to receive a fair equivalent for his service, and we ought to be willing to give it.

Mr. GWINN said:

That the gentleman had remarked that every man must bear his own sins, and he would accordingly assume his share. He had heard much said with reference to the character of the reports, and would take the opportunity to state his views.

He could say with the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) that during the time the reporter was employed to prepare sketches, he was never able to recognise in them, the substance of any speeches he had delivered on this floor. The reporter had invariably given him the privilege of correcting his votes—indeed, he would have

taken it—and if it had not been accorded, he should have moved to dispense with his services. He had exercised that privilege.

No remarks of his, had extended over a column and a half in the journal of debates, so far as they had been printed—so that every gentleman must know, from the number of times he had occupied the floor, and it was evident, therefore, that he had confined himself within the limits prescribed to the reporter. And further, he would say, that the duty of the reporter was perfectly fulfilled, when an opportunity was given to every speaker of ascertaining that the arguments made in the Convention were fairly presented to the public. This was a privilege which all should have. They had a right to have speaking for themselves and for their constituents their views and expressions, thus recorded in the manner in which they submitted them, and in harmony with the sense they were intended to convey. The reporters idea of a condensed argument was not always the idea of the speaker or of the Convention.

In conclusion, if this right were not conceded he should move for the discharge of the reporter. It was a matter of indifference to him whether the Convention adopted the system of reporting in full, or preferred the abridgements, but it was material that the speaker should be fairly presented to the public.

Mr. STEWART, of Caroline, should not have said a single word, had he not heretofore taken some part in the subject under discussion. It was well known that when this matter was first under consideration, he voted against employing a reporter, and afterwards moved a reconsideration of the vote when the reporter was employed. It was his impression at that time, that the reporter was to report the full debates of this Convention, and not mere sketches. But it appeared that after they had decided to employ a reporter, the Committee reported that it would be proper to have these sketches, and not full reports. He would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee into a statement that had been going around in the papers, for he felt interested in the matter. He saw it stated in one of the Baltimore papers, the Argus, which also referred to the paper in Annapolis, that there were gentlemen, who they were he knew not, who went before that committee and offered to do both the reporting and printing of the debates, in full, for \$6,500, let the Convention sit as long as it might. They were ready to give sufficient bond, to be approved of by the committee, that they would execute the contract. He would like to know why these gentlemen were not employed, for he thought it was due to them that they should have been? He knew nothing about this matter, not being on the committee. A committee was appointed whom it was supposed could settle this matter better than the Convention could. When this committee reported, he of course relied on its report. No sooner had a reporter and printer been employed, than he saw it stated that two or three persons had offered to do this very reporting and printing—not sketches, but full debates, the