

The Agricultural Society of Albemarle adopted the following resolution on the 2<sup>d</sup> November 1833. —

Resolved that a committee of five be appointed by the President to draft a memorial to the next Legislature asking an amendment of the inspection laws of flour so as to require the inspector to brand all flour of a grade equal to City Mill Superfine with the brand of Extra Virginia, or some other distinguishable brand mark, and to set forth in the memorial their reasons for such a change in the law, and that the committee endeavour to bring the subject before the people of Albemarle at their December Court, and confer with individuals in the adjoining counties for the same object, and in the mean time to obtain subscribers to the memorial, and that each member of the society will exert himself to the same end.

To the General Assembly of Virginia:

In obedience to the above resolution the committee present the following petition —

That your honorable body would take under consideration the laws now existing for the inspection of flour, believing that like all laws of a similar kind, amendments are occasionally necessary to keep pace with the change of circumstances occurring in an improving country. When these laws were originally enacted in their present form they designated truly the different grades of flour to which brand marks were directed to be applied, each its designated quality. — But while these marks have been stationary, marking now the same qualities they did thirty years ago, improvements in the culture and management of wheat, improved machinery in Mills and increased skill in Milling, have kept the quality of flour progressive, and new classes have been manufactured for which no legal brand mark exists sufficiently distinct. Hence purchasers must look to the private brand of the Miller to determine and give character to the lots they purchase. But when it is recollected that it is produced more for export than home consumption and that the export of the United States is not far short of a Million of barrels, it will be apparent that in the small Milling establishments scattered through the interior of the country manufacturing annually from two to ten thousand barrels each, the quantity is too small, manufactured at any one of these Mills to give or preserve a character of its particular brand when thrown into foreign markets amidst the great mass of exportation. — Not so however with the Milling establishments of large capitalists who manufacture and brand annually from 20 to 50,000 barrels each. The individual brand here from the quantity manufactured stands in the place of the public brand mark and is benefited by its absence keeping uncer, and out of competition with them all minor establishments

the small parcels of whose good flour can never be known abroad.

To exemplify more distinctly our views we will call your attention to the different prices now given in market for different brands of flour. The difference between fine and superfine is from forty to fifty cents per barrel, & between the different qualities of superfine from one to two dollars per barrel. City brand for export from \$1. to \$1.50 per barrel over others. It cannot be denied that a portion of the manufactures of these lesser Mills is equal in quality to City brand - nor will it be denied that when it is so, the prices are at all approximated. This in the opinion of your petitioners arises mainly from the superfine brand (owing to the causes above mentioned) embracing now too large a class.

This class passing from the prices includes nearly as many qualities of flour as are assigned by all the other brands authorized by law. A subdivision of it is required by the introduction into it of a new brand mark. Should the present quantity of City Mill export flour, be taken as a standard for this brand, every barrel of flour wherever manufactured in the State of like quality would be entitled to the same brand: and it is believed would in a few years approximate to the same price.

The effect of the desired change in the law would in the opinion of your petitioners essentially operate as an improvement of the quality of the great staple of the State, by offering an encouragement to the interior millers to raise the quality of their flour to that standard. As the law now exists no matter what the quality of this flour they cannot hope to attain a price much above ordinary superfine. It then becomes their interest by grinding merely to pass the inspection and manufacture the lowest quality of that class. Added to this a system of private marks by the inspector, at the request of the holder showing the different quantities of this class, is unavoidably introducing itself which being impossible must in the end lead to confusion and fraud. The large capitalists of the cities and the lesser millers of the interior give a wholesome competition to the trade and it cannot be advantageous to the community that either should labor under disadvantages or enjoy benefits which do not properly accrue from their situation, their capital, their skill or their enterprise. Such is believed now under the existing law to be the case. The difference between the export superfine of the interior and the export superfine of the city is \$1.50 per barrel equal to thirty cents per bushel on wheat and a bounty upon that amount upon all wheat carried to Richmond.

We hazard the opinion that if no change is made in the existing law, that from the Rivanna alone (the improvement of which is now being completed) in two years 150,000 bushels of wheat of fine quality will be thrown into the Richmond market, to the ruin of large capital investment Mills, on and near that River. The same cause is operating the same effects on other parts of James River, and will extend itself as the facilities of transportation are increased: Can it be to the interest of those now convenient

to market that competition should be put down and a monopoly substituted to their injury as well as ours.

W<sup>m</sup> Meriwether  
James Clark  
David Anderson

Members of the committee

William J Wilson  
Francis Bourman  
Thomas W Meriwether

Silburn R. Bailey  
W<sup>m</sup> D. Fitch

James R. Watson  
Chs. Carter M, D,  
Ina Barrett

Andrew Leitch

John Watson

Sam<sup>l</sup> O. Lewis

Jean Raphael

Sam Leitch Jr

William F. Good

John Cochran

Joel Foster

John Vowles

Wm Gullis

John Fry

W. Meriwether

R. L. W. B.

Ja<sup>s</sup> H. Lewis

W. L. Traven

Wm B. Carpenter

Pr Agricultural  
Society Albemarle  
for and of the brand of Flour.

Dec. 28<sup>th</sup> 1833

of 9<sup>th</sup> to 2 & m.

Report reasonable  
Com. Ag & Manufac<sup>rs</sup>  
Jan 1. 1834.

The Agricultural Society of Albemarle adopted the  
following resolution on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Nov 1833

~~Resolved~~ Resolved that a committee of five be  
appointed by the President to draft a memorial to the  
next Legislature asking an amendment of the inspection  
law of flour so as to require the inspector to brand  
all flour of a grade equal to city mill superfine, with  
the brand of Extra Virginian, or some other distin-  
guishable brand mark; and to set forth in the  
memorial their reasons for such a change in the law,  
and that the committee endeavor to bring the  
subject before the people of Albemarle at their  
December court, and converse with individuals  
in the adjoining counties for the same object, and  
in the mean time to obtain subscribers to the  
memorial, and that each member of the society  
will exert himself to the same end.

The committee appointed by the President

Wm H. Merritt, John H. Craven

David Anderson James Clark &

Daniel F. Carr

It was moved & carried that the President  
and 1<sup>st</sup> V. pres. be added to the committee

To the Gen. Assembly of Virginia.

Resolutions  
of the  
A. S. A.