

generally sold by measure, and will continue to be thus sold, probably to the extent of one million of bushels per year. This leaves six millions of bushels on which the tax may probably be levied, yielding \$15,000 of which \$5400 will be absorbed in the payment of the compensation of the Inspector General and his four assistants. It cannot be the interest of the State to impose a tax on its citizens all of which may be, and in all probability at least one half will be lost in the expenses of collection.

I think it proper to mention that the member of the Legislature who introduced the last clause of subsection 2 article 389 of the grain inspection act of 1852, states that it was his intention in so doing to give permission to the seller to exempt his grain from all charges, and that it was thus understood by the public and by Mr. Chaplain who under this impression declined to accept the office of Inspector General of Grain when it was offered to him.

The Courts have never yet acted on the questions now in dispute between the dealers in grain and the Inspector General, as has been intimated by him. In fact no other Inspector General has ever claimed the right to weigh or to interfere in any way with the weighers of uninspected grain.

As Mr. May's interpretation of the inspection laws has never been sanctioned by the Courts and is different from that of his predecessors and entirely at variance with the general understanding and custom here, those engaged in the grain trade feel authorized to resist it, and it is under these circumstances that they have appealed to your Excellency to protect them from his oppression and extortion while the matter is pending before the Courts, and to require him to offer every facility for a speedy decision of the questions.

Yours Respectfully

Geo. S. Williams President  
Pro tem of the Baltimore Corn  
and Flour Exchange Association

State of Maryland  
Executive Chamber  
Annapolis May 12<sup>th</sup> 1852.

Geo. S. Williams Esq.

Pres. Balto. Corn & Flour Exchange

Sir:

In reply to yours of 9<sup>th</sup> Inst. in which you still complain of the conduct of Mr. May the Inspector General of Grain, I have only to say that my approval of his course as expressed in my previous letter is founded chiefly upon the tenor of his circular a copy of which you enclosed to me. Judging from that, his object seems chiefly to be to put an end to the practice heretofore existing of the weighing or