

The representation of a people can never do more, than they may be enabled to do by the people at large can do.
The case then would be contrary to our liberty;
because it would not be equal:

It is a settled principle in all free governments, that the nation has no right to deprive an individual of his property unless it is absolutely necessary to the public good and then only after a full compensation has been previously made to him.
It is by consent in a great measure, in the exclusion of property in the gift of fortune and all the means of a man's industry.
Now who in any one slave denies this right though it is in a case which may appear favorable to liberty I should consider that by doing so in one instance they break down the barrier which is the security to property and that this opens a door to a breach at a hundred times as soon as it is entered.
Compelling a man to give up his own labor, always done as property in the gift of many years industry or the means of labor and social and civil, as the means of doing, and the free children's portion, and as the means of making it a scene of such they own a right in them to be sacred to be spoken with and in property which none but a tyrannical government can deprive them of, unless it shall be proved to be entirely necessary for the public good, and then only in paying them for it.

Government of Kentucky is to be considered as standing in the place of the Government of Virginia. Now then ought this Government to be established between government and the owners of slaves. Though by law slaves do not belong to property as such but they are to be bought and sold. But the owner should have this property secured to him as effectually as his land or any other species of property. The new laws which (Virginia) has now taken a step in this case for the owners or one of them. I think no person has a right to interfere with them unless it is that they have that power which is contrary to their true interest to allow it.
and then for they will now do them all for.

What does further say on this occasion, admitting both propositions to be right, yet as the owners are induced by their act to do a new confession as a way to give them money for this property of a loss to be sustained should be by the state and as the original cause of error which they are not to be liable upon a principle of right or a principle of policy.
Thus of course! deprive the owners of their property they must from the principle of labor slaves pay for it and also for the added cost, that they have been the means of the loss to the individual.

Great and injurious and confusion would arise from such a measure. whether the owners hold them by gift from a parent or by purchase.
Very common for parents to give land to one or two and negroes to the rest. And then the one that has land, has all the work of a man and purchases them and can discharge them because he is doing and obliged to hold them in slavery. The others have no voice to them and the purchaser may come upon them again for the purchase money. A good deal to those who have sold on purpose and have clamored.

It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its members but also to guard our part of the society against the injustice of the other part. and it is a principle founded both on reason and liberty that

The same person should not be both judge and party.
The measure violates both these principles as a small part of the citizens only own slaves. They will be oppressed by the act of the majority who have no property of their kind. They will have no fellow feeling in the step which they will take.
and as the measure is supposed to be for the public good and as the most able and most near on to be for the benefit of the majority, adopt the measure. They are by that measure doing to themselves a benefit at the expense of the owners of slaves, and with it contributing any thing to and at them at all. If this partial proceeding is a method now a similar conduct to make the minority a majority can fall on a plan may be a public benefit.
and then who would be in the majority upon this occasion may be in the minority on most others.
every citizen is equally interested in preventing such measures and our government and laws on a basis of being founded in justice with the founded in justice and in the end of being a republic of free citizens, and all be a tyrannical tyrants and slaves.

But she intended to bring this about by degrees. Still the objection as to the right of doing the thing continues the same. I am not to have no more right to take my property from me 20 years hence than now.
No man is to say I shall lose the child than the mother.
man's - color - principal - interest -
This now - than when a child is to be done without negroes - 20 years a half of them now alone and the charge -
than but after a while discharge.
The owner must work to support them, or let them run away and get a life as many friends to come upon them now do.
This modification of the plan is an insult to our understanding and a temporary measure proceeding from the fear and not the justice of the proposition. They know they don't wish immunities to be on - so full of it!

It is proposed to emancipate them and the work of it is supposed they are actuated by principles of justice in the present plan. It is impossible then can be the case. They must consent to one of two kinds of persons.
1. Those who have slaves, or
2. Those who have none.
Those who have slaves cannot be in earnest on this. What they say as to their rights, or they are very few men. Others are they would accept them as a form of the true liberation by law and man emancipate them and a fellowship in freedom with a new sun rising it.
Those who have none cannot be actuated by such motives of justice. They are members of the community. They are to be held as slaves. But this measure as they declare to be so much for the public good should be done at public expense. Thus they are utterly opposed to the public interest. I gather an of philanthropy and generosity when they can be practicing at other men's expense.
Trembling of two papers - one man - one heard - will not speak better to make poor men slaves. The number of them is much greater on the whole. It is at any time that from one man to give to another - justice not being the motive for their conduct. A man has to do some work to be found to proceed from envy - and a desire of opening the door to a relation and a means of their getting labor done by them as to will be more easily imposed than the present set of labor and!

But the favourers of the scheme say that although it does intrude on the right of property, yet as it is to support the right of personal liberty it is justifiable as the one right is superior in its nature to the other. The one being derived from our great creator the other not.

- Ans. as may be seen to this:
1. supposing then right to liberty to exist and that it is a proper foundation for supporting it. They do not least to claim the country may do it if they please on paying their owners a just equivalent.
 2. Their natural right are not a subject proper for our enquiry. as government is a compact only between those entering into it. and because in their claim if a part one is derived from a source independent of government altogether. From the very nature of a compact none but those who are parties to it can claim any benefit from it. Therefore as they are not parties to it they can have no right under it. and as they are considered as properly prior to the existence of the government, and belonging to those who are parties to the compact. and as one of the principal ends of the government is to secure the property of those who enter into it. Therefore the right to this property ought to be secured and not challenged by the government.

Of the very reasoning of the favourers of the scheme defeat itself. because it proves too much: All men (say they) are by nature free and equal. Men being equally in habit and as prop. pers of this country with us if they are free and equal with us, have an equal right to a share in the government. That share should be in proportion to their number. But it is one 1/6. but they are totally excluded. Therefore as 1/6 of the people of this country are being equal have been excluded from making the choice of those who are to make a government for this whole it must follow that we have not been legally elected and have no power to proceed.

Let us carry the idea a little further. The general government deriving its powers from the states and most of them having slaves in them who are excluded from all share in the government each of those governments being void because of that exclusion. The authority deriving from them to the genl. government must be void also.

3. Thus an then natural right how can it be reconciled to another to say that all who are now in existence shall continue slaves and that those born before a certain time shall be so till years.

The proposition contains so many absurdities and contradictions in itself, as must be suff. to destroy it.

3. If it is right and proper then it must be so every where else and in each of the other states: let us trace its consequences.

3a. So declaring the slaves are more numerous than the white. If then they were admitted to the rights of citizens and they must

be as soon as they become freemen that would probably happen again which is mentioned by Monlaguier.

"Among the Volunition on the freedom becoming masters of the suffrage made an abominable law which gave them the right of tying fast with the girls married by the free born."

One cause of so improper a proposition being made is that it is not considered in a full capacity and by what authority we are acting.

We are acting as the representation of the freemen of this country, by the authority of these freemen, and for the purpose of forming a government, to secure their liberties and protect their property.

It must be totally improper then for us under an idea that a part of that property is due to a slave, to suppose that it is contrary to natural right to divest them of it without their consent or without paying them an equivalent for it.

If we have a right and ought to interfere such considerations the claim of the individual to the whole country with the four equally placed to the land with that of the negro to their liberty!

do not let us be guided by false notions, or false ourselves in doing you harm to our self when we are holding a debt which is another kind of property from greater numbers.

Let us break up a slave for making a government! Let us be our constitution to abandon the idea by which we own property, and advise the negro to become freemen to form alliance with the true proprietors of the soil.

From whence does this proposition proceed: from the error of the conscience of the proposer respecting the propriety of keeping a fellow mortal in slavery?

It is then a basis upon which conscience alone is concerned, and can be no more the proper subject for any government than any other question depending on it.

That it would be improper in us, as we are, and in the other acts that we are acting, to consider them in any other light than as property, such appear from Monlaguier.

"There are different kinds of law the law of nature the divine law the law of nations and the particular political law which relates to each society, and the government of human reason consists in perfectly knowing the order of things that are to be distinguished as ought to have a principal relation, and not to throw into confusion those principles which should govern mankind. We ought not to be directed by divine laws, what should be decided by human laws; nor determined by human, what should be determined by divine laws."

also 2 March: 170. 171. at large.

2. Supposing we have the right does our liberian policy make it proper that we should exercise this right?

This will not appear to be the case whether we consider the proposition as it affects, the negroes themselves, or this country.

The negroes themselves: by the proposer no more are to be brought into the country, and all born in it after are to be free.

20-4

[The page contains extremely faint, illegible handwriting, likely bleed-through from the reverse side. The text is organized into several paragraphs across the page.]

See the census for the prop^y of them here and the Bluff states
2^d prove that the number here sold - distributed -
to them should be added the voluntary mancipations of them who
live on the same and have slaves
+ and the voluntary contributions of those who have none
they cannot be so sure if they do not do both - then will be their
tentation -
+ I do by consent only in the dominion of equal laws, made with
common consent, for the equal interest on the public good

Blumen der vor. v. d. d. d.
un. d. d. d. d. d. d.
to d. d. d. d. d. d.
carolina and Georgia.

8207

my M^{rs} on such a day as I can
 spare and ought to undertake
 counting to the satisfaction
 of those in trust a noblest
 right on the other —
 and as Mrs. Long and Mrs.
 Brown of New York are
 in the room of a place —
 and Mrs. Brown of New York
 is in the room of a place —
 and Mrs. Brown of New York
 is in the room of a place —

[illegible]