

a very valuable document; and I regret extremely that I cannot furnish you with a copy. It contains a mass of information which would be invaluable to your committee. We have only one copy, and that bound in a volume. The report was drawn up by the Hon. Arphaxad Loomis, of Little Falls, Herkimer county, but now in Washington, as a member of the House of Representatives. Since your communication came into my hands, I have written to his office to obtain a copy for you, but without success. I do hope that it may be in your way to have an interview with him, and, if possible, to obtain the report. Aside from that, the best general answer to the above inquiriss that I can refer you to is found in our Inspectors' Report for 1834, beginning at page 23, and reaching to the *summary* on p. 106.

“26. ‘What busines can be prosecuted at your prison, or at any other on the same plan, with least injury to the out-door laborer, and at the same time support the institution?’” Although our impression is, that the *most productive* kinds of business may be selected, without material injury to citizen mechanics, and that those kinds will rtil be prosecuted in this prison, without producing any serious complaint hereafter, yet it may be well to give an extract, touching this point, from the above-named report. ‘In the selection of the branches of business to be carried on in the prisons, (say the Commissioners,) the officers in charge acted as might have been expected of them, under the legal instructions by which they were governed. They introduced those well-established branches of business which the common wants of the country had fully developed, and which common experience had shown were practicable and profitable. Had they confined the operations in^{the} prisons, in each branch of business, to the extent that it could be carried on by the convicts already skilled in the particular branch, there could have been no just ground of complaint. Take, for example, shoemakers, of whom there are forty-three among the convicts confined at Auburn, who were mechanics before their conviction. Instead of employing 43 only at that branch, there are 48 engaged at that business. But if they had employed but the original shoemakers at that business, and had not taught the trade to other convicts, it would have been right in every sense. They would have merely compelled the idle and wicked to follow with assiduity their regular calling; the number of mechanics in that branch would not have been increased; nor would discharged convicts be turned out to enter shops where they were not free to enter before conviction. Had this course been adopted in respect to all other branches of mechanical labor which are carried on in this country to, or nearly, to, the amount of the consumption, and no other employed there, in any given trade, than those who had previously learned it out of prison, no just ground of complaint would have existed. This then shows us at once the proper rule to be adopted.