firmed the independent fovereignties of the usurpation, and with them the fanguinary laws by which the persons of the Loyalists were attainted and their property confiscated. This treaty was afterwards ratified by his Majesty, and confirmed by both Houses of

Parliament.

Such is the unexaggerated state of the facts which make up the claim of the American Loyalists. It remains to be examined, whether those who are entrusted with the sovereign authority of the British Government, are not under the most sacred obligations to protect the subject in his person and property, in all events, while he performs the duties of allegiance and fulfils the laws of the land? Whether, in the constitution of the British state, there is no law which entitles the fubject to indemnity for property lost in consequence of his fidelity to the Government, or through the want of the protection due to them by law? Whether the fovereign authority may

lawfully cede, in a treaty, the property of the subject without such indemnity? And whether the rights and property of the fubject are so extremely precarious, and the powers of the fovereign authority fo perfectly despotic, that it is authorised by law to dispose of his property, while he fulfils the duties of a faithful citizen, without his consent, on any account or to any purpose whatever, WITHOUT MAKING A JUST COMPENSATION?

CHAP. II.

Of the Rights of the Loyalists to Protection and Indemnity under the fundamental Laws of civil Society, and particularly under those of the British Constitution.

THE right of the Loyalists is not originally derived from an act of the fovereign legislature. Their title to protection and indemnity for their property loft, in confequence of their fidelity to the State, and through the want of national protection, and afterwards given up by his Majesty and Parliament to the United States of America, is perfectly founded on laws coeval with the institution of that authority, and which gave it existence. It is easy to perceive that we

here