

no redress, the adjudication of their losses, and of course their sufferings, have been most grievously protracted; and their expenses in prosecution of their claims, have been very considerably augmented; whereas they had confidently hoped, that on the amount of the awards in their favour being ascertained, which are not one-third part of their losses, that their allotted compensation would have been as prompt as that extended nearly thirty years ago, to all their other fellow sufferers.

Earnestly soliciting an answer, and indulging the hope that it will be favourable to such just expectations,

I have the honour to be, my Lord,
your most faithful and obedient humble servant,
R. W. Powell,

Earl Liverpool,
&c. &c. &c.

Agent for the American Loyalists.

N^o 11.—10th June 1817; Copy of a letter from R. W. Powell, esq. to the Right honourable N. Vansittart.

Sir,

London, 10th June 1817.

I BEG leave most respectfully to enclose, for your perusal, the copy of a letter written to lord Liverpool, containing a summary of the merits of the case of the American loyalists, as evidently distinct from that of the other claimants, and to request your dispassionate attention to our losses and sufferings, and to the national justice which is due us.

The sum awarded us by the board, under the convention, from the circumstances of delay and difficulties of proving the claims for want of evidence, is a pittance in comparison to what would have appeared to be due, had the claims been investigated at an earlier period; for to require a proof of the solvency of debtors, after a lapse of twenty years, was, in many instances, to ask an impossibility. And that the sums, amounting on average, to not one third part of the losses, awarded by commissioners appointed by ministers after thirty years, shall not be paid to those loyalists, who in the day of trial, came forth at the risque of life, to support the constituted authorities, is surely a most dangerous precedent in this age of licentiousness and treason; especially when the legislature has so recently voted large sums to aid the suffering loyal subjects of other kingdoms, shall it be said, that her own subjects, the children of her own family, shall be treated with neglect and injustice, when the nation has acted so liberally towards the distresses of loyalty in other countries.

I have been informed by Mr. Macdonald, that you have required his opinion upon the claims, which he told me he had given you before he had seen the case of the American loyalists. "That the merchants are equally entitled to compensation for the balances of the awards of the commissioners." It is therefore incumbent on me to observe, that his brother-in-law was agent for conducting forty-four of the merchants claims, on which the sum of £.537,760 was awarded by the commissioners, and he would be entitled to his commissions on any further sum that might be received on account of those claims, which with the commissions he has already received from the distribution of the compromise, would yield him a handsome fortune; under such circumstances, without meaning any reflection, is it not natural to suppose, that Mr. Macdonald must regard with some degree of favour, the eventual success of the merchants claims? He has likewise compared the claims indiscriminately to debts due by a bankrupt's estate, where all creditors would receive an equal dividend. But were the United States, by whose laws the loyalists were deprived of their property, in a state of bankruptcy? Or is this Government, that promised them protection, and afterwards sanctioned this very loss of their property, by the treaty of peace, unable to pay them? On double grounds, therefore, the loyalists claim their right to compensation; first, under repeated and solemn assurances of protection; and secondly, for the sacrifice of their property, acknowledged by the prime minister, to have been made as the price of peace; insisted upon, too, by the enemy, as a preliminary to negotiation; which right is supported by all writers on the law of nations, admitting of the king's power to dispose of the property of his subjects, but, with this consideration, *That the state is obliged to make good such losses to the subject, out of the public revenue.*