

that I place no reliance upon the representations made here of disaster and destruction from the extinction of slavery in other places. Gentlemen have not pretended that disaster followed the extinction of what little slavery there was in the Northern States. But the case of the West India Islands has been cited at great length. Now, I submit that no man has carefully read the reports of travellers, and the statistics which they give, of those islands since the extinction of slavery there, but must be forced to the conclusion that on every score, in every point of view, the West India Islands have been immeasurably benefited by the extinction of slavery. I ask gentlemen to go to those prime authorities; do not take statistics from some of the reckless anonymous scribblers who are pandering to a desire to carry a certain end. Take the authorities themselves and read them. Take Cochin's "Results of Slavery," his "Results of Emancipation," the "Ordeal of Free Labor in West India." I have named but two or three, but there are scores of them. And they all force the human mind, without the possibility of resistance, to the point that no man can be found who does not labor more persistently, more correctly, more reliably and intelligently as a free man, than he who labors unwillingly as a slave. I will read one extract only from Sewell's "Ordeal of Free Labor in the British West Indies," p. 66. After summing up statistics, with which I will not weary the Convention, he says:

"It cannot be intelligently questioned, that Barbadoes, under the regime of slavery, never approached her present prosperous condition; and, in comparing the present with the past, whether that comparison be made in her commercial, mechanical, agricultural or educational status, I can come to no other conclusion than that the island offers a striking example of the superior economy of the free system."

That is but a sample of what follows after almost every summing up of the statistics, and the statistics fully sustain the remark. But I do not choose to base my argument upon what appears there.

I choose to come home, and when I say "home," I mean to the United States chiefly, to our own doors here in Maryland, and I ask any man to take up the successive census returns of the United States, and examine them impartially and candidly, and then tell me what system of labor is found to be best in the United States. I do not fear the result of such an examination by any one.

It is now but about eighty years since these States started as one government. At that time their institutions, though not strictly homogeneous, yet assimilated very much throughout all the States. Virginia, the Old Dominion, was the first State in population, as she was the first in date of settlement; first in

wealth, first in everything. Then followed Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Massachusetts, New York, the fifth, and Maryland, the sixth. I will not go on with the list further. Thus the States started. Slavery existed in all of them, save Massachusetts, and it had existed there but a short time previously. Very shortly afterwards steps were instituted for the extinction of slavery in all the States north of what is known as Mason and Dixon's line—in the New England States, in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. The other States retained and still retain, a considerable amount of slave labor. We have in this State some 87,000 slaves still remaining. Meanwhile the course of empire has taken its way westward, and in all instances the more southern portions had the advantage of prior settlement; Kentucky before Ohio, etc.

Now, sir, though the States stood in 1790, seventy-four years ago, as I have stated, how do they stand now? Virginia, from being the first, has become the fifth in point of population, and when I say "in point of population," I mean the aggregate of population, free and slave, black and white. If it be taken upon any other basis, then she sinks far below that point. Why, sir, Virginia, with eight times the territory of Massachusetts, with a soil incomparably superior, with mines richer than all Massachusetts—Virginia has about 200,000 less white inhabitants to-day than Massachusetts, and the whole value of her taxable property is some \$50,000,000 less than that of Massachusetts.

And I will say here, that I wish it understood, once for all, that in any references I may make to statistics, I refer not to to-day, although I say "to-day," but I mean the time just before this war had desolated the fields of Virginia, to the census of 1860.

And how is it with Kentucky and Ohio? Let us take two States, side by side, nearly equal in size, Ohio being the twenty-first State in point of square miles of territory, and Kentucky the twenty-second—the one having 39,964 square miles, and the other 37,880. Those States started on their career of progress, Kentucky having the advantage by about thirty years. For a long time she led Ohio, but now Ohio stands as the third in population, while Kentucky has become the ninth. Kentucky sends to Congress eight representatives, Ohio sends eighteen.

Maryland and Massachusetts are nearly the same in size. Massachusetts started as the fourth State in population; Maryland the sixth. Massachusetts, from the growth of other States, has sunk to be the seventh, and Maryland has gone down to the nineteenth.

But population is but one of the indices of progress and prosperity. Look at the accumulation of wealth; look at the value of the land, of the farms, in the several States. Some gentleman, the other day, gravely cited