

then. Now, he, (Mr. S.) would say that the gentleman had admitted the reporter had not reported his speeches in full, but that he, (Mr. C.,) had written them out.

Mr. CHAMBERS thought he had distinctly stated the fact.

The reporter had said to him, he was not by profession a lawyer—that he did not feel competent to condense a legal argument, into one-fifth of its natural dimensions, and that any attempt to do so would do injustice to the argument as delivered. This was no fault of the reporter, nor did it imply, what he, (Mr. C.,) had not said, that the reporter put language into his mouth, as the gentleman has phrased it. The habits and pursuits of the reporter did not enable him to distinguish the nice and important points of law involved in the argument, so as to make a perfect and complete syllabus, or digest of a long and elaborate constitutional argument. The gentleman must surely comprehend this, and perceive how utterly impossible it was. He, therefore, found it necessary to revise and correct the reporter's notes, so as to make them accord with the meaning he designed to convey. He hoped he was now understood by the gentleman and every one else.

Mr. STEWART, of Caroline, said:

He understood the gentleman clearly, and he, (Mr. S.,) was not throwing any imputation upon the reporter, because the gentleman had said he had been reported as saying absurd things.

Now, he, (Mr. S.,) would ask, if that was a compliment to the reporter to charge him with having reported the gentleman as saying absurd things, and such as he never intended to say? Now, what he asked, did the committee themselves say?

"The only departure which is brought to the notice of the committee from the terms of the original contract has occurred in some reports of speeches by the members themselves, which extended beyond the sketches of debates as expressed in the terms of the contract, *whereby the extent and expense of said debates have been greatly increased.*"

The reporter gets paid for all these long speeches, that he never reported, and without this departure, the four thousand dollars would have been ample for the reporting of the sketches for two months to come.

Now, the gentleman from Kent, [Mr. Chambers,] also made an argument to the effect, that he, [Mr. S's,] friend, [Mr. Thawley,] had said that this Convention had got more work than it had agreed to pay for. Mr. Wheeler had said, that by the fifth of April, the appropriation would be entirely exhausted.

Now, he had enough to pay him up to the fifth of April, and if the Convention had the debates up to this time, it would be a just estimate. There was one thing he desired to refer to in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Prince George's, (Mr. Bowie.) The gentleman had referred the Convention to the debates in the Virginia Convention, and he, [Mr. Stewart,] found that when he got them they, were report-

ed up to within two or three days of their last proceedings.

Now, what did Mr. Wheeler say, "that the debates are not allowed to accumulate for forty-eight hours on the hands of the reporter," and yet we did not get them printed until three or four weeks after they have been delivered. Had he known that they were to be kept so long waiting for them, he would never have voted for a reporter.

He would say, that he would rather have paid \$20,000 for the debates to have been furnished the following day, after their delivery, than to have given \$4,000, and then have to wait weeks for them. It had not been a rule of action of his life to purchase cheap things, because they almost always turned out in the end, to be the most expensive. Be sure that a thing is needed and then buy it of the best quality. There was an illustration of the fallacy of buying cheap things in the present case.

He had been willing to pay him a proper compensation, and if the Convention had been disposed to have paid Mr. Wheeler a sufficient sum at first, to have enabled him to obtain accurate reporters, we should not have heard the outcry that had been made.

He would vote for the reconsideration; but, as he had said before, he would like to know from the chairman of the committee whether there were any persons ready to give bonds for the reporting and printing of the whole of the debates for \$6,500, and if so, why they were not employed?

Mr. HOWARD moved the previous question, but withdrew it at the request of

Mr. STEWART, of Baltimore city, who said, he would simply call the attention of the gentleman from Allegany, [Mr. Smith,] to the fact that the contract was taken from the committee by the Convention, after it had been submitted to the Convention and approved. He had intended to make some other remarks, but he did not wish to trespass upon the time and patience of the Convention.

Mr. SMITH interposed and said:

That if the gentleman, (Mr. Stewart, of Baltimore city,) would permit him, he would explain. He, (Mr. S.) had the contract before him. He saw that certain duties were to be performed, and he believed the duty of seeing the contract properly carried out, devolved upon the committee.

Mr. STEWART, of Baltimore city, remarked, that it was the duty of the reporter to have confined himself to the agreement.

Mr. SMITH said:

That the gentleman knew that the debates had been more extended within the last few weeks, and it was his duty to have interposed with the reporter.

Mr. STEWART, of Baltimore, replied that the gentleman supposed that he, [Mr. S.,] knew, but he did not know, in his official character, whether the reporter was furnishing sketches or full debates. It was a matter of calculation upon the vouchers submitted by the reporter, and upon that he had granted his warrant, as chairman of