

Negative—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Dent, Lee, Mitchell, Donaldson, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Lloyd, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, John Dennis, Williams, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, McCubbin, McMaster, Hearn, Fooks, Thawley, Hardcastle, Kilgour, Waters and Hollyday—26.

So the 5th section as amended was adopted.

The 6th section was then read, as follows:

Sec. 6. All offices for the weighing, gauging, measuring, culling or inspecting any merchandize, produce, manufacture or commodity, whatever, except tobacco, are hereby abolished, and no such office shall hereafter be created by law; but nothing in this section contained, shall abrogate any office created for the purpose of protecting the public health, or the interests of the State in its property, revenue, tolls or purchases, or of supplying the people with correct standards of weights and measures, or shall prevent the creation of any office for such purposes hereafter.

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER moved to strike out this section. He did not think it prudent to change the present system of inspections, and in his opinion, if they should abolish it, it would be injurious to the State at large.

Mr. Tuck offered as a substitute for said section, the following:

"All offices by Executive appointment for the weighing, gauging, measuring, culling or inspecting any merchandize, produce, manufactures or commodity whatever, except tobacco, live stock, hay and straw, shall be abolished after the first day of January next; and no such office shall thereafter be created by law; but nothing herein contained shall abrogate any office created for the purpose of protecting the public health or the interests of the State in its property, revenues, tolls or purchases, or of supplying the people with correct standards of weights and measures, or shall prevent the creation of any office for such purposes hereafter; and it shall be the duty of the Legislature at its first session under this Constitution, and from time to time thereafter, to pass such laws as may be deemed necessary or expedient for licensing persons to weigh, gauge, measure, cull or inspect any merchandize, produce, manufacture or commodity whatever, except tobacco, live stock, hay and straw."

Mr. Tuck judged from certain indications that this clause would meet with no little opposition, and from quarters whence it was least to have been expected. The time allowed under our rules was too limited for a full discussion—but he would briefly state some reasons in support of the measure. It is by no means certain that advantage had resulted from all our inspections—though I believe there have been exceptions. We know that these appointments are political, and being rewards for services rendered, capacity has not always been one of the qualifications. It is notorious that men have been appointed under all administrations to these and other offices who had their duties to learn after receiving their

commissions. During this season of tutelage, we might as well have had no inspections at all. The official mark or brand was no evidence that the article had been well examined, and judiciously passed upon. I believe that government patronage begets more corruption and vice than all other causes combined. I mean corruption and vice as connected with elections and offices. Gentlemen have said here that they were in favor of stripping the Governor of all patronage. We shall see when the vote is taken how nearly practice approaches profession. We shall see whether the party in power are willing to surrender the lever by which the political character of the State is too often determined. We shall see whether they will do any thing to rid the Governor of the hordes of office seekers, who annually infest the avenues to the executive department—calling aloud to be rewarded for their very disinterested and patriotic exertions in his behalf—either at ward or district meetings, or at the polls. It would be a great service rendered the people—a great promoter of harmony and peace in society—if this end could be accomplished.

Free inspections have been introduced into New York, and some other States. Some gentlemen say the plan has worked well—others say the contrary. But there is this difference between that system and the one we propose. In New York the law does not regulate the matter at all. We propose that inspections shall be made under authorised licenses. Instead of a man becoming an inspector by executive patent, we say let him take out his license, and let skill, judgment, and merit be his passports to patronage and support. In all branches of business a man must depend for success on these tests; and where there is any business, no man can fail to obtain employment who has such claims to favor. No man would dream of taking out a license who did not know that he possessed the necessary qualifications. He would not be employed if he did not possess them. We know in every community who excel in the different branches of business. Persons holding these licenses, even if their work did not make them known, would not hide their merits under a bushel. Indeed this was illustrated only a few years ago. Governor Pratt appointed two or three lumber inspectors, who had held office under some of his predecessors. Being well known, as acquainted with their duties, these few soon obtained all the work. But as each of the others had earned his commission—it would not do to let it prove an empty honor—and hence, when they found they could not procure work to support themselves and families, they resorted to an expedient to obtain support without work. They procured the passage of a law requiring the fees received by all the inspectors to be brought into a common fund, and then equally divided among all. Skill, and capacity, and labor were to pay tribute to ignorance and idleness, or the public must put up with the services of men who did not command their confidence.

But it is objected that licensed inspections will give no value to our brands—that our inspections will lose their "State character." Must this