

property of the Begums, he says, " If it had,  
 " it would certainly have compelled him to  
 " the instantaneous application of the only  
 " remedy which offered. As these Jaghires  
 " were the supposed or assumed cause of the  
 " insurrection, Mr. Hastings should, without  
 " delay, being first convinced of the truth,  
 " have resumed them, and GIVEN THE POS-  
 " SESSORS, AS BEFORE OBSERVED, THEIR  
 " JUST RIGHT TO A COMPENSATION."

Shortly after, he repeats and enforces the  
 same principle of law and justice; and adds,  
 " But admitting the right to the resumption,  
 " THE GUARANTEE OF THE COMPENSA-  
 " TION SHOULD HAVE BEEN INVIOLEABLE.  
 " Instead of this, ' he asserts,' the Jaghires  
 " were resumed; the compensation guaran-  
 " teed, and this treaty afterwards *violated*;  
 " and that the good faith of this country, and  
 " the law of nations, should have taught Mr.  
 " Hastings rather to have *preserved and pro-*  
 " *tected, than injured and destroyed the rights of*  
 " *the Begums.*"

This act of Mr. Hastings, in resuming the  
 property of the Begums, without *adequate com-*  
*penensation*, he concludes, with reprobating in  
 the strongest terms, and declares, that he was  
 convinced, " the national character had been  
 " debased

" debased and degraded, and it was only by  
 " an act of national justice it could be restored  
 " to its wonted brilliancy, excited by its fa-  
 " cred attachment to HONOUR, JUSTICE, and  
 " HUMANITY."

Here we find, that the law, and every  
 principle of justice, asserted in this speech, are  
 the same we have laid down in the preceding  
 pages, and manifestly prove the right of the  
 Loyalists to compensation. The Minister, with  
 much learning and truth, considers the pro-  
 perty of the subject, as sacred and inviolable,  
 under the laws of civil society, and the pro-  
 perty of an ally, under the laws of nations;  
 and candidly declares, that neither can be de-  
 prived of it without "*criminality in the de-*  
 "*spoilers*;" but upon TWO principles, in case  
 of " forfeiture by delinquency, or when the  
 " necessities and preservation of the State re-  
 " quire it." And when that necessity de-  
 mands it, he repeatedly affirms, that the re-  
 sumption cannot be *lawfully* made WITHOUT  
 ADEQUATE COMPENSATION. This com-  
 pensation he declares is the " CRITERION,"  
 the " PROVISIO," or condition of the right,  
 and that it ought to be *most sacredly made to*  
*the despoiled*, whether they be *subjects or al-*  
*lies.*