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It is said, that when the people make a constitution, and delegate powers, that all powers not delegated by them to those who govern, is reserved in the people; and that the people, in the present case, have reserved in themselves and in there state governments, every right and power not expressly given by the federal constitution to those who shall administer the national government. It is said, on the other hand, that the people, when they make a constitution, yield all power not expressly reserved to themselves. The truth is, in either case, it is mere matter of opinion, and men usually take either side of the argument, as will best answer their purposes: But the general presumption being, that men who govern, will, in doubtful cases, construe laws and constitutions most favourably for increasing their own powers; all wise and prudent people, in forming constitutions, have drawn the line, and carefully described the powers parted with and the powers reserved. By the state constitutions, certain rights have been reserved in the people; or rather, they have been recognized and established in such a manner, that state legislatures are bound to respect them, and to make no laws infringing upon them. The state legislatures are obliged to take notice of the bills of rights of their respective states. The bills of rights, and the state constitutions, are fundamental compacts only between those who govern, and the people of the same state.

In the year 1788 the people of the United States make a federal constitution, which is a fundamental compact between them and their federal rulers; these rulers, in the nature of things, cannot be bound to take notice of any other compact. It would be absurd for them, in making laws, to look over thirteen, fifteen, or twenty state constitutions, to see what rights are established as fundamental, and must not be infringed upon, in making laws in the society. It is true, they would be bound to do it if the people, in their federal compact, should refer to the state constitutions, recognize all parts not inconsistent with the federal constitution, and direct their federal rulers to take notice of them accordingly; but this is not the case, as the plan stands proposed at present; and it is absurd, to suppose so unnatural an idea is intended or implied, I think my opinion is not only founded in reason, but I think it is supported by the report of the convention itself. If there are a number of rights established by the state constitutions, and which will remain sacred, and the general government is bound to take notice of them—it must take notice of one as well as another; and if unnecessary to recognize or establish one by the federal constitution, it would be unnecessary to recognize or establish another by it. If the federal constitution is to be construed so far in connection with the state constitutions, as to leave the trial by jury in civil causes, for instance, secured; on the same principles it would have left the trial by jury in criminal causes, the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus, &c. secured; they all stand on the same footing; they are the common rights of Americans, and have been recognized by the state constitutions: But the convention found it necessary to recognize or re-establish the benefits of that writ, and the jury trial in criminal cases. As to EXPOST FACTO laws, the convention has done the same in one case, and gone further in another. It is a part of the compact between the people of each state and the rulers, that no EXPOST FACTO laws shall be made. But the convention, by Art. 1. Sect. 10. have put a sanction upon this part even of the state compacts. In fact, the 9th and 10th Sections in Art. 1. in the proposed constitution, are no more nor less, than a partial bill of rights; they establish certain
principles as part of the compact upon which the federal legislators and officers can never
infringe. It is here wisely stipulated, that the federal legislature shall never pass a bill of
attainder, or EXPOST FACTO law; that no tax shall be laid on articles exported, &c. The establishing
of one right implies the necessity of establishing another and similar one.

On the whole, the position appears to me to be undeniable, that this bill of rights ought to be
carried farther, and some other principles established, as a part of this fundamental compact
between the people of the United States and their federal rulers.

It is true, we are not disposed to differ much, at present, about religion; but when we are
making a constitution, it is to be hoped, for ages and millions yet unborn, why not establish the
free exercise of religion, as a part of the national compact. There are other essential rights,
which we have justly understood to be the rights of freemen; as freedom from hasty and
unreasonable search warrants, warrants not founded on oath, and not issued with due caution,
for searching and seizing men’s papers, property, and persons. The trials by jury in civil causes,
it is said, varies so much in the several states, that no words could be found for the uniform
establishment of it. If so the federal legislation will not be able to establish it by any general
laws. I confess I am of opinion it may be established, but not in that beneficial manner in which
we may enjoy it, for the reasons beforementioned. When I speak of the jury trial of the
vicinage, or the trial of the fact in the neighbourhood,—I do not lay so much stress upon the
circumstance of our being tried by our neighbours: in this enlightened country men may be
probably impartially tried by those who do not live very near them: but the trial of facts in the
neighbourhood is of great importance in other respects. Nothing can be more essential than
the cross examining witnesses, and generally before the triers of the facts in question. The
common people can establish facts with much more ease with oral than written evidence;
when trials of facts are removed to a distance from the homes of the parties and witnesses,
oral evidence becomes intolerably expensive, and the parties must depend on written
evidence, which to the common people is expensive and almost useless; it must be frequently
taken ex-parte, and but very seldom leads to the proper discovery of truth.

The trial by jury is very important in another point of view. It is essential in every free country,
that common people should have a part and share of influence, in the judicial as well as in the
legislative department. To hold open to them the offices of senators, judges, and officers to fill
which an expensive education is required, cannot answer any valuable purposes for them; they
are not in a situation to be brought forward and to fill those offices; these, and most other
offices of any considerable importance, will be occupied by the few. The few, the well born, &c.
as Mr. Adams calls them, in judicial decisions as well as in legislation, are generally disposed,
and very naturally too, to favour those of their own description.

The trial by jury in the judicial department, and the collection of the people by their
representatives in the legislature, are those fortunate inventions which have procured for them
in this country, their true proportion of influence, and the wisest and most fit means of
protecting themselves in the community. Their situation, as jurors and representatives, enables
them to acquire information and knowledge in the affairs and government of the society; and
to come forward, in turn, as the sentinels and guardians of each other. I am very sorry that even a few of our countrymen should consider jurors and representatives in a different point of view, as ignorant, troublesome bodies, which ought not to have any share in the concerns of government.

I confess I do not see in what cases the Congress can, with any pretence of right, make a law to suppress the freedom of the press; though I am not clear, that Congress is restrained from laying any duties whatever on printing and from laying duties particularly heavy on certain pieces printed, and perhaps Congress may require large bonds for the payment of these duties. Should the printer say, the freedom of the press was secured by the constitution of the state in which he lived, Congress might, and perhaps, with great propriety, answer, that the federal constitution is the only compact existing between them and the people; in this compact the people have named no others, and therefore Congress, in exercising the powers assigned them, and in making laws to carry them into execution, are restrained by nothing beside the federal constitution, any more than a state legislature is restrained by a compact between the magistrates and people of a county, city, or town of which the people, in forming the state constitution, have taken no notice.

It is not my object to enumerate rights of inconsiderable importance; but there are others, no doubt, which ought to be established as a fundamental part of the national system.