A Landholder VI, *Connecticut Courant* 10 December 1787

[Answer to George Mason's Objections]: *The general legislature is restrained from prohibiting the further importation of slaves for twenty odd years—*

But every state legislature may restrain its own subjects; but if they should not, shall we refuse to confederate with them? Their consciences are their own, tho their wealth and strength are blended with ours. Mr. Mason has himself about three hundred slaves and lives in Virginia where it is found by prudent management they can breed and raise slaves faster than they want them for their own use, and could supply the deficiency in Georgia and South Carolina; and perhaps Colonel Mason may suppose it more humane to breed than import slaves. Those imported, having been bred and born free, may not so tamely bear slavery as those born slaves and from their infancy inured to it; but his objections are not on the side of freedom, nor in compassion to the human race who are slaves, but that *such importation render the United States weaker, more vulnerable, and less capable of defense.* To this I readily agree, and all good men wish the entire abolition of slavery as soon as it can take place with safety to the public, and for the lasting good of the present wretched race of slaves. The only possible step that could be taken towards it by the Convention was to fix a period after which they should not be imported.

CITE AS: John P. Kaminski et al., eds., *The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution*, Vol. III: Delaware, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut (Madison, Wis.: Wisconsin Historical Society Press, 1978), 489–90.