do gentlemen seek to win and wear the title?—He had been called upon to define the term reformer. Well, he, (Mr. P.,) would admit that he might have some difficulty in defining the term if he consulted the dictionaries, but not the least if he looked to the popular acceptation of the term.

He called a man a reformer who was in favor of altering the present basis of representation to a more liberal system, by which the rights of the majority, if not fully established, would be strengthened and supported. He would call a man a reformer if he was disposed to take middle ground from choice and not necessity.

But he would call no man a reformer who avowed himself in favor of no change and would not yield any thing but from the fear of being called upon to yield more.

Would the gentleman desire to have an indictment read, that he might escape, not from the substance of the charge, but through some flaw or quibble in the draught? Perhaps the gentleman might take up some technical objections; he was familiar with the loop-holes of metaphysical defences.

If we lived in the day, when doctors would dispute upon the question—how many would dance upon the point of a needle? (Laughter.) he might be called upon to define with more minuteness than he had done, the distinction between reformers and anti reformers. He might instance the vote in favor of the proposition of the gentleman from Kent; no one who voted for that plan, could in his judgment, lay any claim to the character of a reformer.

Mr. Merrick stated, that he had voted against the amendment of the gentlemen from Washington, (Mr. Fiery,) but had always been in favor of a compromise.

Mr. Presstman. Very true, sir, he had always esteemed that gentlemen as disposed to be liberal, and he did not believe he was desirous that no change should be made, and had not voted for Mr. Chambers plan.

While upon the floor, he would say a few words upon the main question as it was not his intention to speak upon that subject again. He did not wish to interpose between the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) and his friend and colleague, (Mr. Brent,) who had had what might be almost termed a passage at arms this morning. For both gentlemen he entertained a high regard, and each was capable of defending himself.

It was due to the gentleman from Baltimore county, (Mr. Howard,) to say that he was right in supposing that the delegation from the city of Baltimore, was divided upon the question of representation, not that in the opinion of either one of them, that the claim of the city had been fully met and granted, but in an entire unwillingness on the part of those who advocated the compromise, to defeat that measure and thereby jeopardize, in their opinion, the interests of the people of Baltimore.

Those of us who sustain the compromise agree fully in the opinion expressed by him that the sentiment of the people of Baltimore, would sanction under the circumstances in which the Convention is placed, a fair and liberal adjustment.

His colleague, (Mr. Brent,) would do him the justice to say, that he had voted for the incorporation of the principle of representation according to numbers in the House of Delegates. He had stated more than once that the people of Baltimore desired the popular basis in the fullest latitude, but it was due to truth and candor to say, that he avowed, from the beginning, that looking to the basis upon which the Convention was called, he did not believe that his constituents regarded the strict adherence to that principle as a *sine qua non*. He would now reiterate, that he could not bring himself to believe that any common sense man, within the limits of the city of Baltimore, expected that principle to be carried out to its fullest extent at this time. In some future Convention it possibly may. When he voted for the proposition of the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. Fiery,) he knew that no plan as favorable to the city of Baltimore would be offered, and even that would not have been if a portion of the Baltimore delegation had not, by the conciliatory course pursued by them, produced a better state of feeling with reform members from the counties, than existed at the commencement of our session.

Mr. Brent wished simply to call the attention of his colleague to the fact that there was now a proposition lying upon the table to give twenty-four representatives to Baltimore city.

Mr. Presstman would be most happy to respond to the suggestion. He would vote against the proposition because every man in the House knew it would not command two votes. As long as the reformers of the counties could stand by the compromise, he was in good faith ready to uphold it. Why, sir, does not my colleague know that there is not the first man who voted with him against the compromise who is prepared to give to the city of Baltimore as high a representation as that plan proposes? And sir, let me say to him, that two out of the four Democrats who voted against that plan, (Messrs. Sappington and Stephenson, of Harford,) are unwilling to give even ten delegates to the city of Baltimore. Can the delegation of Baltimore city expect, for a single instant, to control the settlement of this question on more favorable terms? He was willing to confess that he felt the necessity of support in a grave crisis like the present, and rejoiced to think that if he had erred, he had at lest the proud satisfation of knowing that he was enlisted on the same side with men not only distinguished by every virtue which could characterise a statesman, but men had grown grey in the service of the people—men whom the great