

7

IN respect to the first proposition, whether a Negro can, in this Province, be a Slave, I would just observe, that such a question has never yet come directly before any of the Courts of Westminster-Hall. I say directly, because it certainly has several times come before them in a collateral way, as I shall take occasion, in a subsequent stage of the present inquiry, more particularly to remark. It is to the statute Law of the Mother-country, I presume, that we are principally to look for a solution of this very interesting question. And when we come to recur to the original Charter constituting the African Company, the several Royal confirmations of it, the several Proclamations to secure the exclusive trade against interlopers, and particularly the 23. Geo. 2. (which latter lets in all his Majesty's subjects, without exception, to an equal participation in the African trade;) we shall be at a loss to discover any legal grounds for supposing Negroes, who are constantly mentioned as Slaves, not to be truly and legally such.

IN the ninth of the privileges granted by this same original Charter, which was made by Charles the Second, in the year 1661, Negroes are expressly named as one article of exclusive traffic. And why a Negro, so made an article of traffic, should not be as much the property of a Company trader, as Ostrich Feathers, Indigo, or Gold Dust, is an enigma which I am unable to unravel.

THE Preamble of the 23. Geo. 2. recites, "that the trade to and from Africa, being very advantageous to Great Britain, and necessary for the supplying the Plantations and Colonies belonging thereto, with a sufficient number of Negroes, at reasonable rates, ought to be free and open to all his Majesty's subjects." And accordingly the trade was made free and open by an enacting clause of the same act.

UNDER the latitude of this and other acts it was, that the