of improvement and prosperity, there is no comparison whatever. The change is seen the instant you cross the line, which separates the country where there are slaves, from that where there are none. Even in the same State the parts where slaves most abound are uniformly the most cultivated, the poorest, the least populous, and the least improved; while wealth and improvement uniformly increase, as the number of slaves in the country diminishes. I might prove and illustrate this position, by many examples, drawn from a comparison between different States, as Maryland and Pennsylvania; and between different Counties in the same State, as Charles County and Frederick in Maryland: but it is unnecessary, because every body who has seen the different parts of our Country, has been struck by this difference.

Whence does it arise? I answer from



from this; that in one division of country the land is cultivated by freemen, for their own benefit; and in the other almost entirely by slaves, for the benefit of their masters. It is the obvious interest of the first class of labourers, to produce as much and consume as little as possible; and of the second class to consume as much and produce as little as possible. What the slave consumes is for himself; what he produces is for his master. All the time that he can withdraw from labour is gained to himself. All that he spends in labour is devoted to his master. All that the free labourer, on the contrary, can produce is for himself. All that he can save is so much added to his own stock. All the time that he loses from labour is his own loss.

This, if it were all, would probably be quite sufficient, to account for the whole difference in question,