

the license system, as proposed by him, did not exist there. In that State they had a free license system without any authority at all. His proposition was that the Legislature should provide by law for licensing these persons. They had twelve lumber inspectors and three or four flour inspectors. Could not the Legislature regulate all this in regard to fees, &c.? Why could it not be done in reference to the license system as in reference to the free system? The law now regulated the officers who were to be appointed, and could not the law regulate persons who were to take out licenses in the same way? The difference between this State and New York, was that in New York the law refused to have anything to do with it. He proposed that in this State the Legislature should license the inspector, and penalties may be prescribed, to protect the buyer and the seller against corruption and malpractice.

In reference to Baltimore city, and the change of the inspection system Mr. (T.) would say that the gentleman was older than he was, and perhaps participated in the change, but he knew, from his recollection of the matter what no one will deny, that it was not altogether for the reason assigned by the gentleman that the appointment of the inspectors was taken from the mayor and city council, and given to the Executive.

It was because they gave the inspections to Baltimore people, and did not give any of the appointments to the counties. The people of the counties being sellers, had a right to the office as well as the people of Baltimore, and they complained of combinations and frauds. No gentleman who was familiar with the history of public affairs, would deny that this did enter into the causes of the change, and the gentlemen of the upper counties were the very persons who came here and demanded that the law should be changed, so that inspectors might be taken from the counties as well as from the city of Baltimore. It was a contest between the counties and Baltimore, and nothing more; and now he would make a remark or two in regard to the suggestion of the gentleman from Queen Anne that he should except fish. Had any one present ever seen a barrel of fish inspected? Perhaps they had. He had seen some inspected by the State inspector. A man knocked off the heads, the inspector with a small hook took up one or two fish, rarely going below the second row, and the thing was done, except putting on the official brand, indicating that this mighty work had been performed by a man holding a commission under the great seal of the State. Could not any other man acquainted with salting and packing fish do this quite as well? This seemed to be the only question.

I see no necessity for excepting flour—but I have done so at the request of gentlemen from the grain growing counties. We must not compare this plan with the New York system. Indeed they have no system here at all; and there is the fault. Any man may inspect there, or probably a great deal is bought without any inspection at

all. But Baltimore flour is not always bought by the inspector's brand. I never know who inspects my flour. I always buy that from a particular mill. The miller, with me, gives value to the flour. I can go to Baltimore, or send there, and buy as good flour without any inspection, as if all the instruments of all the inspectors had passed through it. Baltimore flour always commanded a higher price than the New York flour under any inspection. And this was so when they had State inspections like ours. If the New York flour has fallen in estimation it is because they have no inspections under State authority as we propose here. I do not wonder that the dealers are opposed to it, because the present system relieves them from responsibility. If they sell flour for anything else after having been inspected, they are not responsible for the quality of the article. Though you may compel them to take it back, when sold, they are not to blame. They have bought an inspected article. But if you have licensed inspectors, dealers having a choice, will always buy the brands of a man of known skill and merit as an inspector. It will make all men more particular in their purchases of inspected articles.

I am surprised at the great opposition which this clause has received from the reformers. A measure may be a reform measure or not according as it affects this party or that. I had hoped that reform would show itself in the assertion of some great cardinal principle—and that the same principle would be extended to one party, that was applied to another. But it seems that reform depends more on expediency than principle—and that the effect of a measure on persons and parties has much to do with the favor it receives in a body, a majority of whom profess to be reformers of all existing abuses in government. They have taken very little from the Governor's patronage—that little indeed is scarcely of any value to his party—and all that is of consequence in controlling elections and keeping his party in power is left with him, to be used, as doubtless it will be, for the purposes to which power is usually applied. Most of the reform adopted here, as to appointment to office has consisted in abolishing offices now held by Whigs, or changing the mode of appointment so as to make vacancies, and give the other party a chance of filling some of them. But when this opportunity is presented of relieving the Governor from responsibility, and preventing corruption among the people, the proposition is resisted on arguments that seem to me to be rather founded on political expediency than principle.

Mr. SHRIVER moved the previous question, which was seconded, and the main question ordered, viz. on the adoption of the amendment of Mr. SPENCER.

And the question being put, the amendment was rejected.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the amendment of Mr. TUCK.

Mr. GWINN asked a division of the question on the motion to strike out and insert, and the ques-