"ter's right to his fervices may *poffibly* remain." By this last passage it no less appears that a Negro, before he lands in England, is a Slave.

I understand attempts to have been made, to make the Case of a Negro, and that of a villain, parallel Cafes.

On this head I would just observe, that the most characteristic marks of difference which at prefent occurs to me, between these two description of Men, seem to First, a villain was, at the worst of times, be thefe. capable of holding lands by long usage or immemorial cuftom. Secondly, if he purchased lands or goods, and afterwards fold them before his Lord had feized upon them, the last purchaser would hold them against the claim of his Lord. But neither of these languid sparks of Freedom belong to a Negro Slave. For if lands fhould be devifed to fuch a Slave, I apprehend the Mafter could not enter upon them, but that the heir at Law might enter, and claim them as an undifposed part of the real Estate. I believe it to have been a generally received opinion, even in New-England, where Slaves were treated with greathumanity, that they were rendered fo incapable of acquiring property themfelves, that it could not be derived through them to any one elfe .---In fhort, they were confidered as incapable of receiving any thing, except through their Mafters : And confequently their Masters could not receive any thing through them, except their earnings and fervices. No Man, who coolly reflects on the ftate of a Negro Slave, in all the afpects of it, can help feeing, that the ftate of a villain is but very faintly analogous to that of the former.

No Man who has the lawful poffeffion of goods, can be the object of an action of Trover, till after demand and refufal, becaufe, till then, there can be no converfion. The conversion, therefore, being the very point of the action, must necessarily be under the control of the

18

the Lav