

To these we will add one authority more. Judge Blackstone, when treating of the protection due from the Legislature to the subject, in the most decided manner declares, that
 “ so great, moreover, is the regard of *the law*
 “ for private property, that it will not au-
 “ thorise the *least violation of it*, no, not even
 “ for the general GOOD of the *whole com-*
 “ *munity*. Besides, the *public good* is in
 “ nothing more *essentially* interested than in
 “ the protection of every *individual's private*
 “ *rights*, as modelled by the municipal law.
 “ In this, and similar cases, the Legislature
 “ alone can, and indeed frequently does, inter-
 “ pose and compel the individual to acquiesce.
 “ *But how does it interpose and compel?* Not
 “ by stripping the individual of his property
 “ in an arbitrary manner, but by giving him
 “ a *full and ample indemnification and equivalent*
 “ for the *injury* thereby sustained.”

From these and many other authorities, it evidently appears, that Parliament has ever held itself bound by the law of the land, to make compensation to the subject for property taken or destroyed by the State, either to avoid some public mischief, or to obtain some public benefit; for property lost through a failure in the State, to afford him the pro-
 tection

tection due by law, and for property lost in consequence of his faithful exertions to defend the public interest and safety: while there is not one to be found of a contrary tendency or spirit, nor one where the compensation claimed by the Loyalists, has been delayed beyond the session of Parliament in which the application has been made. Indeed the right is so replete with public merit and equity, and the law from which it is derived has been so well understood, that it has never been disputed or doubted. It is, as the most eminent civilian in Great Britain declared, when his opinion was taken upon it,
 “ A TRUISM which admits of no POSSIBI-
 “ LITY OF DOUBT.”