

Either rate of wages, it is believed, much exceeds the average paid at private manufactories, considering the women and children employed therein at wages far below the lowest of the above rates. This is the extent of the cheapness of Penitentiary labor, and whatever it be, it does not allow the authorities of the institution to depend upon it; on the contrary, they are compelled to observe a constant care and watchfulness to obtain the highest market prices for its manufactures, in order to guard against loss, (which has sometimes happened, and, in the fluctuations of the market, is always liable to happen,) and thereby prevent a resort to the state treasury, for the support of the institution.

It must therefore, be apparent, that the complainants suffer no injury from the *cheapness* of Penitentiary labor, unless the authorities of the institution wantonly and capriciously *undersell* its manufactures. This, it is believed, is not pretended—certainly it cannot be shown. On the contrary, there is more uniformity and fewer alterations in their prices and terms of sale, than are observed in regard, perhaps, to any other manufactures in our market. The labors of the Penitentiary, it is true, were unusually profitable the last year. According to the report of the Directors, the nett profits, after defraying all expenses, were upwards of \$10,000; from which it is fairly to be inferred that the goods of the Penitentiary could not have been sold *under price* in the market. It may also be inferred, that the private manufacturers must have been well enabled, out of the profits of their business, to have paid the artizans employed by them, a fair price for their labor. If they have not done so, it cannot justly be imputed to the operation of Penitentiary labor, although it may suit their purposes so to impute it: and we are of opinion that this is one of the principal sources of the clamor against the Penitentiary; the mechanics themselves, no doubt, sincerely believing that the labor of the Penitentiary does operate injuriously upon them.

If we have proved, as we trust we have, that the State derives no advantage from the *cheapness* of Penitentiary labor, over that of those who complain—but that in fact, for all manufacturing purposes, it is really the *dearest* labor—let us inquire how the manufactures of the Penitentiary come into injurious competition with those of the private manufacturers in the market.

Is it not plain, that so long as free intercourse is open with the other states of the Union, and our market can be supplied with their manufactures, even those of their *Penitentiaries*, to any extent of demand whatever, the competition is *not* merely between the Maryland manufacturer and the 110 or 120 looms of our Penitentiary, but between the manufactures of Maryland and those of all the other states which send their manufactures to our market, including also their Penitentiary manufactures! The amount of domestic cotton and woollen goods supplied by other states and sold in Baltimore annually, is estimated at from seven to ten millions of dollars; so that the market for such goods is regulated and