

were divided, and thrown into a common fund. The system, it was said, worked well, and it was likely would continue, for under it, there was a fair and proper distribution of duty. He hoped the House would leave the matter to the Legislature. He had searched the records of the Legislature during the last ten years, and had only found three or four memorials coming from the city of Baltimore, and they were wounded upon the alleged misconduct of these individual inspectors.

Mr. PHELPS said that this was a subject in which the people he had the honor in part to represent, felt deep interest. So with regard to the wood corders and lumber inspectors, but especially the former, for there was a very large class of his constituency, engaged in carrying wood and lumber to the city of Baltimore. The complaint was universal, and he had never heard a single individual who did not complain of the treatment they received in Baltimore, with regard to inspectors.

Gentlemen had said that flour and tobacco should be inspected. He concurred in this because they required inspection. But it was not so with lumber, staves, plank, and cord wood. Every body could see their quality for themselves, and it was nonsensical that there should be inspectors for the purpose of contracting between A and B, in regard to these principal articles of trade. The purchaser ought to be able to say, I will give you so much for plank and lumber. The parties were competent to make engagements for themselves, but now they had to call in a third person, and the fact was that the people of their Shore, who were engaged in this trade, were cheated out of the larger portion of their profits.

Mr. SPENCER remarked that if they should abolish the inspectors, the corporate authorities of Baltimore would appoint inspectors. They would appoint wood corders, who, instead of being under the control of the wood corder of the State, would be under the control of the city of Baltimore.

Mr. PHELPS had no objection to the license system. If the Constitution should provide that they should not have wood corders or lumber inspectors, and every man should be competent to contract in his own way, they could prevent the authorities of Baltimore from interposing a third party between individuals. He had no particular objection to the license system, because then it would be a matter of choice, and they could select whom they pleased. He desired to break up the union between the lumber inspectors, wood corders, and wood hucksters, and if he had his way, he would abolish this kind of inspection altogether. He believed that all articles which could not be seen or examined properly, and judged of by the masses, should be inspected. In regard to staves, lumber, and plank, it was a matter which the people could examine for themselves, and he did not see why persons of the age of twenty-one years should not have the privilege of making their own contracts in their own way.

If the office of wood corder alone was abol-

ished, in his estimation, thousands of dollars would be saved annually to his own constituency. That a most baneful collusion exists between the wood corders and wood hucksters, as they are called, of the city of Baltimore, to the direct injury of the people from the counties, who trade in this article, is universally believed. To such an extent has this species of traffic been carried of late, that it is now impossible to sell a cargo of cord wood to any other than to these hucksters, and at such reduced prices as will secure to these parties, when re-sold to the citizens, a large profit. Abolish this class of officers, and then no barrier will exist between a legitimate and fair trade being conducted between the sellers and the citizens, for their own proper use.

The laws of trade, Mr. President, should be free and unrestrained; and parties allowed to act for themselves, apart from the trammels of police regulations, which serve only to embarrass and to impose useless taxation and difficulty. In fact such officers are worse than useless, and should be at once and forever abolished.

Mr. BROWN should vote to strike out the section. If they should have licensed inspectors, those persons would only be able to have licenses who were assured that they would be employed by the large dealers of the city of Baltimore.— No man would leave his home in the country, and go to Baltimore for the business of taking out a license to engage in a business, when he did not know whether he would be able to obtain employment or not.

If they should find that they could obtain work, they would be under the control of the dealer, whoever he might be, and the producer, whose labor was to be passed on, would never have the choice for his protection. No producer or consumer should have the appointment of the party to decide in reference to the quality of the article but they should have some person as distant as possible from both to decide for them, and they could not find that person except in the Governor of the State.

In his opinion the system proposed would cause more cheating than was practised under the present one. The inspectors were more dependant upon the Governor, under the system proposed, they would be dependant upon the producer or consumer. Now they could act more independently; they had a duty to perform, and there were no influences acting upon them. This would not be so if they should adopt the license system.

They should make the inspectors independent of both parties; if they did not, they would find that the price of flour would decrease. He should like also to see tobacco inspectors.

He undertook to say, this was the entering wedge of a new scheme, and he had no doubt that system in the State of New York was gotten up by the people interested in it. For the reasons he had given, he would go for the existing inspection of all articles.

Mr. THOMAS made some remarks which will be published hereafter.

Mr. TUCK said that in regard to New York,