

the same right to make original compacts as their ancestors had? If every man has such right, may there not be as many original compacts as there are men and women born or to be born? Are not women born as free as men? Would it not be infamous to assert that the ladies are all slaves by nature? If every man and woman born or to be born has, and will have, a right to be consulted, and must accede to the original compact before they can with any kind of justice be said to be bound by it, will not the compact be ever forming and never finished, ever making but never done? Can it with propriety be called a compact original or derivative, that is ever in treaty but never concluded?"

When it has been said that each man is bound as soon as he accedes, and that the consent may be either express or tacit, it has been asked, "What is a *tacit* consent or compact? Does it not appear plain that those who refuse their assent cannot be bound? If one is at liberty to accede or not, is he not at liberty to *recede* on the discovery of some intolerable fraud and abuse that has been palmed upon him by the rest of the high-contracting parties? Will not natural equity in several special cases rescind the original compacts of great men, as effectually as those of little men are rendered null and void in the ordinary course of a court of chancery?"

There are other questions which have been started, and a resolution, of them demanded, which