

**Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library**



**GIPE-PUNE-003257**

**SPEECHES**  
**OF THE**  
**MANAGERS AND COUNSEL**  
**IN THE**  
**TRIAL OF WARREN HASTINGS.**

**EDITED BY**  
**E. A. BOND,**  
**ASSISTANT KEEPER OF THE MANUSCRIPTS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.**

**VOL. II.**

---

**PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS  
OF HER MAJESTY'S TREASURY.**

---



**LONDON:**  
**PRINTED BY GEORGE E. EYRE AND WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,**  
**PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.**  
**FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.**

**PUBLISHED BY**  
**LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, & ROBERTS.**

---

**1860.**

V2, L. 48

A859.2

3.257

## CONTENTS.

---

	Page
<b>SUMMARY of PROCEEDINGS on the TRIAL</b> - - - - -	i
<b>COPIES of the SPEECHES</b> - - - - -	xiv
<b>CONTENTS of the SPEECHES</b> - - - - -	xlvii
<b>SPEECH of the Rt. Hon. E. BURKE ; 21st April 1789</b> - - - - -	1
CONTINUATION ; 25th April 1789 - - - - -	62
CONTINUATION ; 5th May 1789 - - - - -	109
CONCLUSION ; 7th May 1789 - - - - -	171
<b>SPEECH of J. ANSTRUTHER, Esq. ; 16th February 1790</b> - - - - -	210
<b>SPEECH of the Rt. Hon. C. J. FOX ; 7th June 1790</b> - - - - -	271
CONCLUSION ; 9th June 1790 - - - - -	372
<b>SPEECH of the Hon. A. ST. JOHN ; 23d May 1791</b> - - - - -	425
<b>SPEECH of Sir J. ERSKINE ST. CLAIR ; 30th May 1791</b> - - - - -	447
<b>ADDRESS of W. HASTINGS, Esq. ; 2d June 1791</b> - - - - -	482
<b>SPEECH of E. LAW, Esq. ; 14th February 1792</b> - - - - -	524
CONTINUATION ; 17th February 1792 - - - - -	578
CONCLUSION ; 21st February 1792 - - - - -	635
<b>SPEECH of T. PLUMER, Esq. ; 23d February 1792</b> - - - - -	685
CONTINUATION ; 29th February 1792 - - - - -	742
CONTINUATION ; 1st March 1792 - - - - -	796
CONTINUATION ; 24th April 1792 - - - - -	851
CONCLUSION ; 26th April 1792 - - - - -	899

---

A

SUMMARY

OF

PROCEEDINGS ON THE TRIAL.

---

It has been suggested as desirable to connect the several speeches contained in the present publication by notices of the intervening proceedings on the trial; and it has been judged that such notices would be most conveniently introduced by being brought together, in a narrative form, at the commencement of each volume. In entering on the plan at the present point, it will be necessary to supply here what should properly have been prefixed to the first volume—to join with the account of the proceedings connected with this portion of the work a view of the course of the trial from its commencement. Any indication of opinion in favour of either the prosecution or defence will be avoided; and nothing further will be attempted than to narrate the occurrences of each day's sitting of the Court, and briefly to refer to public incidents directly influencing or growing out of the impeachment, in order that the progress of the trial may be present to the reader's mind as he takes up each succeeding speech.

Little occurred that requires mention during the period embraced in the first volume: the speeches themselves are the engrossing objects of the earlier part of the trial. The evidence which they introduced or commented on was received with little opposition from the Defendant's Counsel; and it is not our object to detail the

Plan of the  
Summary.

Little objection raised to evidence offered for the two first charges.

Opposition  
to evidence  
on the other  
charges.

dence itself, which was published at the time by authority of the Court. Although exception was sometimes taken to evidence, and angry discussions occasionally arose between the Managers and Counsel, the course of the proceedings during the prosecution on the two first Articles of the impeachment was comparatively smooth. But in supporting the sixth Charge, relating to presents alleged to have been received from corrupt motives, the Managers were again and again opposed by the Counsel for the defence, in their endeavours to introduce particular matters of evidence. The contests arising from these differences were carried on in arguments which sometimes extended over the entire day's sitting of the Court; and the questions proposed were of so nice a character that the proceedings were more than once suspended, while they were referred to the Judges for solution. In some instances, the disputes between the Managers and Counsel were determined by the mere expression of the Lord Chancellor's opinion; but more commonly they were formally discussed by the Lords, who, on such occasions, retired from the Hall to their own chamber, for the purpose of considering their judgment, and, on their return, announced it through the Chancellor. The duration of the trial was much affected by the frequency of these discussions. Although the number of sittings of the Court occupied by the prosecution on the two first and the two second charges was nearly the same, the time over which they were spread was very unequal. In the former case, the sittings were included in one session of Parliament, from the beginning of February to the 13th of June, 1788; in the latter, they were spread over three sessions; partly, it is true, owing to interruptions of a special character, but in a considerable degree in consequence of the numerous adjournments of the Court for lengthened periods, to allow opportunity to the Lords for debating on, or to the Judges for considering, the questions disputed between the parties. The struggles were occasioned by the difference of view taken by the Managers and Mr. Hastings' Counsel of the rule proper to be followed

regarding the admission of evidence. The former chafed at the restraints imposed on them by the forms of Common Law Courts, and asserted the right of adducing such evidence as bore upon their case without regard to technical limitations. The latter used all their skill as lawyers in baffling these pretensions of their opponents, and were ever on the watch to resist the slightest informality; and each imputed to the other the design of defeating justice by endlessly protracting the proceedings. The altercations between the contending parties, principally conducted by Mr. Burke and Mr. Fox, on the part of the Managers, and by Mr. Law on the side of the Defendant, were often of an angry tone. They were reported in full by Mr. Gurney, who was employed by the Managers as their short-hand reporter, and who, not by deputy, as implied in our previous mention of this subject,\* but, as we have the authority of his grandson, Mr. Joseph Gurney, for stating, with his own hand, took notes, still extant, of the whole proceedings.

The preparations for the trial in Westminster Hall, and the ceremony of opening the Court, have already been described;† and we shall now endeavour to give a short connected narrative of the proceedings from day to day; not, as we have said, attempting to dissect the evidence brought forward, but simply stating the subject which occupied the attention of the Court at each of its sittings, and noticing the numerous disputes which arose on the admissibility of evidence, and other incidents illustrating the history of the prosecution. 1788.

The Court was formed on the 13th of February, 1788, and, simultaneously with the first exercise of their functions as prosecutors, the Managers were obliged to protect themselves from attempts to discredit the honesty of their motives. On the 14th of the month, Mr. Fox called the attention of

Opening of  
proceedings,  
13 Feb. 1788.

\* See Vol I., Introduction, p. xlii.

† See Ibid., p. xxxix.

1788. the House of Commons to a pamphlet, of a libellous character, published by Mr. Stockdale, and read passages from it, in which the charges against Mr. Hastings were asserted to be groundless, and his impeachment ascribed to party feelings. The motion for a prosecution by the Attorney General was supported by the Ministers, after a slight amendment of the terms of it; and the trial of Mr. Stockdale in the Court of King's Bench, on the 9th of December following, when he was defended by Mr. Erskine, resulted in a verdict of acquittal.

Prosecution  
of libellous  
pamphlet.

The two first days, the 13th and 14th of February, were occupied in reading the Articles of impeachment, and Mr. Hastings' answers to them.

Burke's  
opening of  
the impeach-  
ment.

On the 15th of February, Mr. Burke commenced his General Opening of the charge, and continued his speech through the two following court days, the 16th and 18th of February, terminating it on the following day.\*

Opposition  
to wish of  
Managers to  
try each  
Article sepa-  
rately.

After the conclusion of Mr. Burke's speech, the Managers of the prosecution and the Counsel for the Defendant immediately found themselves at issue as to the order of the future proceedings. On the part of the prosecution, it was urged by Mr. Fox that ea Article ought to be taken separately, the evidence produced and the defence made to it, as a distinct charge; and he referred to precedents in the conduct of the impeachment of the Earl of Macclesfield and Lord Strafford. This course was objected

---

\* It is stated by the author of the contemporary "History of the Trial" that—"In the course of the first day's speech he worked up the passions of the Court in so powerful a manner, when he described the sufferings of the native Hindoos under the government of Mr. Hastings, that the Court repeatedly called out 'Hear I hear!'" And, in reference to the description of the cruelties practised by Deby Sing on the inhabitants of the province of Rungpore, on the third day of his speech, the same author states that—"In this part of his speech Mr. Burke's descriptions were more vivid, more harrowing and more horrible, than human utterance, on either fact or fancy, perhaps ever formed before. The agitation of most people was very apparent, and Mrs. Sheridan was so overpowered that she fainted." Mr. Burke is described as "dropping his head upon his hands a few minutes," overcome by his own emotions. He was shortly afterwards taken ill, and obliged to discontinue his address for that day.



to by Mr. Hastings' Counsel, who insisted, on grounds as well of convenience to the Court as of justice to their client, that the evidence on all the Articles should be brought forward before the Defence was opened. The Lords withdrew to their chamber to consider their judgment. 1788.

The question was regarded as of considerable importance to the success of the prosecution, and much difference of opinion was shown in the discussion of it in the House of Lords. Although the House eventually adopted the opinion of Lord Chancellor Thurlow, who, at great length, argued in favour of the course proposed by Mr. Hastings' Counsel, as many as thirteen peers, including the Dukes of Devonshire, Bedford and Portland, with Lord Loughborough, entered a protest against the decision of the majority.

On the next court day, the 22nd of February, addressing the Managers, the Chancellor said, "I have, in charge, to inform you that you are to produce your evidence in support of the prosecution before Mr. Hastings is called upon for his defence."

Immediately after the announcement of their Lordships' judgment, Mr. Fox proceeded to open the first Article of the impeachment, relating to the treatment of Cheyt Sing, Raja of Benares, and concluded his speech on the same day. His auditory is stated to have been more numerous than that of any previous day of the trial.

On the 25th of February, Mr. Grey opened the remainder of the first Article of the charge;\* and, on the conclusion

---

\* The following is the criticism of the author of the "History of the Trial" on the character of Mr. Grey's speech, and his manner of delivery:—"Mr. Grey was nearly two hours in delivering his speech. His manner was suited to the occasion; he was fervid, graceful and impressive. He was collected, without arrogance; free in his expression, without any rattle of volubility; firm in his sentiments, with scarcely any disgusting obduracy to the defendant. Mr. Grey spoke like a man in earnest. He did not philosophise, agitate and edify, so powerfully as Mr. Burke; but he showed some reading and some abstract reflection. He not only declaimed, but his speech had, what is less attainable by so young a man, much good arrangement and lucid order."—History of the Trial, &c., Part I, p. 20.

1788. of his speech, the Managers proceeded to adduce evidence in support of the charge.

Evidence on the First Charge.  
Reading of Mr. Hastings' Defence before the House of Commons.

After the examination of witnesses to prove the terms of the royal charter granted to the East India Company, in 1696, the appointment of Mr. Hastings as Governor General, and the Act of Parliament of 1774, the Managers were proceeding to read Mr. Hastings' Defence to the first Article, delivered before the House of Commons, as entered in the journals of the House, but were stopped by the Counsel, who insisted on the original minutes of the Defence being produced, with which demand the Managers complied.

Question of reading extracts from documents.

On the 26th of February, the ninth day of the trial, various papers were read as evidence on the first Charge; and, in reference to an objection made by the Managers to the unnecessary reading of an entire document by the Counsel, when a portion only was cited, the Lord Chancellor decided that "if a paper is produced it must be read entire, if required by either party, and that the House, for the present, must put a confidence in the party who shall insist upon its being so read entire that they will not do it frivolously."\* An objection was made by the Counsel, at the end of the day, to the reading of a letter from the court of Directors to the Governor General and Council, offered as proving a breach of orders by Mr. Hastings, there being no allegation of the offence in the Article, and the Court adjourned.

Objections to evidence of offences not in the charge.

Decision in favour of Managers.

On the 28th of February, the Lord Chancellor announced that the Managers were at liberty to read the letter objected to by the Counsel. Further documentary evidence was then read, without opposition, together with several extracts from Mr. Hastings' Narrative of the Insurrection in Benares, in 1781.†

Question of reading extracts.

On the 29th of February, other extracts were read from Mr. Hastings' Narrative, and further documentary evidence

\* "Minutes of the Evidence," p. 46.

† The entire Narrative is printed in the "Minutes of the Evidence," pp. 109-270.

adduced. A discussion arose on a proposal by Mr. Adam 1788.  
 for printing the extracts from Mr. Hastings' Narrative  
 in the "Minutes of the Evidence," without reading them  
 in Court; the proposal was rejected, at the suggestion of  
 Earl Stanhope, and the extracts were read at length. Oral  
 testimony was taken during the latter part of the sitting;  
 and Mr. John Stables, Mr. Fox Calcraft, both of whom had  
 served in a military capacity in Benares, and Mr. John  
 Benn, who had been the assistant to the Company's Resident  
 at Benares, were examined. A question being put by  
 the Managers to the latter witness, to show he had given  
 contrary evidence before the House of Commons, objection  
 was raised by the Counsel for Mr. Hastings, on the ground  
 that it was "perfectly new in judicature that any person  
 producing a witness should himself undertake to impeach  
 his credit." Arguments were heard on either side; it  
 being explained on the part of the Managers that their  
 object was to show "that the witness had not said clearly  
 that which we can prove, from a former examination, it was  
 in his power to say." It being late in the afternoon, the  
 Lords adjourned to their own chamber, and the question in  
 dispute was referred to the Judges.

Examina-  
 tion of  
 Stables,  
 Calcraft,  
 and Benn.

Objection to  
 impeaching  
 their own  
 witness.

Question  
 referred to  
 the Judges.

After an interval of six weeks, occasioned by the absence  
 of the Judges on circuit, the Lords again assembled in the  
 Hall on the 10th of April; when the Lord Chancellor  
 announced their decision that "it was not competent for the  
 Managers to put the question proposed by them to the  
 witness." On the announcement of this resolution the  
 Managers asked leave to withdraw. They shortly returned,  
 and Mr. Fox, addressing the Court, stated it was impossible  
 the Managers could, in their minds, acquiesce in the de-  
 cision. That it was so important to the whole proceedings  
 that only their feeling it a superior duty to proceed with  
 despatch in the trial withheld them from appealing to the  
 House of Commons for instructions. That they were  
 thoroughly convinced they had a right to put the question.  
 That, in cases of impeachment, which are usually directed

Decision  
 against  
 Managers.

Protest of  
 Mr. Fox.

1788. against persons of influence, the witnesses are likely to give unwilling testimony. That they the more regretted the decision because it was at variance with a previous one, in which their Lordships asserted their adherence to the practice of the lower courts. That they acquiesced, "not acknowledging the principle which is held out to us, but upon the principle of convenience—that we would not delay this trial; always protesting in favour of the rights of the Commons of England, which we do not mean to admit it to be a precedent for superseding and for destroying."\*

Mr. Benn  
and Colonel  
Gardiner  
examined.

Mr. Benn and Colonel Gardiner were then examined, principally with respect to the arrest of Cheyt Sing, and his treatment during confinement.†

Anstruther's  
summing of  
evidence on  
the First  
Charge.

Observa-  
tions by  
Mr. Burke.

On the 11th of April, the thirteenth day of the trial, Mr. Anstruther, on the part of the Managers, summed up the evidence produced in support of the first Article of the impeachment. And, on the conclusion of his speech, Mr. Burke made a few observations on the subject of the insults offered to Cheyt Sing during his arrest, and on the treatment shown to Durbejey Sing during his imprisonment.‡ And thus the case for the prosecution was closed on the Benares charge.

Adam's  
opening of  
the Second  
Charge.

Interruption  
by Mr. Hast-  
ings.

On the 15th of April, the fourteenth day of the trial, Mr. Adam opened the second Article of the impeachment, relating to alleged acts of injustice towards the Begums of Oude, the mother and widow of the deceased Nawab of Oude. An incident which occurred during the delivery of his speech requires notice. In the course of his argument, he charged Mr. Hastings with having falsified dates in his Narrative of

\* Gurney's Report, MS.

† It is stated, in the "History of the Trial," that "the Prince of Wales, the Duke of York, and the Dukes of Gloucester and Cumberland, were present during the day's proceedings. The Commons were few in number; and the audience lessened so continually, from time to time, that at last scarcely any hearers but those who were obliged to hear were left in the Court."—Part I., p. 27.

‡ Printed in Volume I., of the present work, p. 362.

the insurrection in Benares. Galled by the imputation, 1788.  
Mr. Hastings whispered to a gentleman in his box that the  
assertion was false. The words were caught by Mr. Adam,  
who, in violent terms, protested against the interruption and  
repeated his charge.\*

On the 16th of April, Mr. Pelham supported the second Article of the charge. On the close of his speech, Mr. Sheridan rose to conduct the evidence to be brought forward on the Article now opened; having first, with the concurrence of the Defendant's Counsel, proposed that, in future, not the whole of any voluminous paper exhibited in evidence should be printed, but only the part specially applying to the subject. He then proceeded to prove a printed paper circulated in the lobby of the House of Commons, and purporting to be a second Defence of Mr. Hastings upon the second Article of the Charge.† Major Scott, who, when Mr. Hastings was in India, had acted as his confidential agent in England, and from the commencement of the present proceedings had been his staunch supporter, both in the House of Commons and in the public press, was examined by Mr. Sheridan on the subject of this second Defence, and stated that he had distributed a few copies of it among members of the House. He was then questioned as to the composition of Mr. Hastings' first Defence at the bar of the House of Commons, and informed the Court that it was written within the space of six days, but that the only portions of it composed by Mr. Hastings himself were the general introduction and the answers to the Articles concerning the Rohilla war and the King's tribute. He specified the authors of the other parts of the Defence, viz., the witness himself, Mr. Halhed, Mr. Shore,

Support of the Second Charge by Mr. Pelham. Evidence.

Arrangement for printing extracts of papers.

Examination of Major Scott, respecting Mr. Hastings' second Defence.

The first Defence composed by friends of Mr. Hastings.

\* The observation of the historian of the trial upon Mr. Adam's speech is as follows—"Mr. Adam was up three hours and an half, and was heard with great attention. In many parts he deserved it. In parts there was a violence liberal men do not love. The Commons were more numerous than usual. The female part of the audience were in greater numbers than have lately been seen."—History of the Trial, Part I., p. 33.

† It is headed "The real State of the Facts contained in the Fourth Article of Mr. Burke's Charge, divested of all extraneous matter in which they are enveloped;" and is printed in the "Minutes of Evidence," p. 362.

1788. a member of the Supreme Council, Mr. Middleton, Mr. Markham, Mr. Baber, Major Gilpin and Mr. Benn; and he stated that many passages were introduced into the paper, by the different contributors to it, which Mr. Hastings himself had never read when it was presented to the House.
- Examina-  
tion of  
Mr. Holt. On the 17th of April, the sixteenth day of the trial, Mr. Holt, who had been assistant to the Resident at Lucknow, in 1779 and 1780, was examined for five consecutive hours, principally with the object of proving Mr. Hastings' influence over the Nawab of Oude; and his examination was resumed on the 22nd of April. It was followed by various written evidence, and subsequently by the examination of Major Brown, Mr. Goring and Mr. Stables.
- Major  
Brown,  
Mr. Goring,  
and  
Mr. Stables. The principal witness examined on the 23rd, the 24th and 29th, of April was Mr. Middleton, formerly political Resident at the court of Lucknow. He is stated to have shown much confusion in giving his evidence, and to have resorted to the plea of forgetfulness when pressed on subjects which it was hard to believe had escaped his memory.
- Examina-  
tion of Mr.  
Middleton. On the 30th of April, Major Scott was again examined at great length, and again on the 1st of May. After which, various letters were produced and read, and Mr. Middleton was once more examined.
- Examina-  
tion of Major  
Scott and  
Mr. Middle-  
ton. On the 6th of May, a great deal of written evidence was given in and read, and Sir Elijah Impey, formerly Chief Justice of Bengal, was examined on the subject of the affidavits sworn before him relative to the insurrection in Benares.
- Of Sir Elijah  
Impey. On the 7th and 8th of May, after the reading of much written evidence, Mr. Middleton was examined on the subject of the seizure of the Begums' jagirs.
- Of Mr. Mid-  
dleton. After an adjournment for the Whitsun holidays, the Court resumed on the 20th of May, when various written evidence was adduced, and Captain Edwards and Colonel Achmutty were examined, mainly in relation to the alleged rebellion of the Begums.
- Of Capt.  
Edwards  
and Colonel  
Achmutty. On the 21st of May, extracts were read from the Persian correspondence, during Mr. Hastings' administration, to show
- Garbling of  
letters.

that the letters had been garbled and mutilated, and that forged papers had been introduced among them. Other written evidence was read, to show that the resumption of the jagirs was against the wish of the Nawab. In the course of the day, Major Scott presented himself for the purpose of correcting a statement made by him at a previous examination, and in which he had denied that he had made any other communication respecting presents received by Mr. Hastings than what he had already mentioned. He now acknowledged a letter to the Chairman of the Directors, detailing every instance of such receipt of presents by Mr. Hastings. Sir Elijah Impey also was called in, to authenticate certain letters which he had delivered to the House of Commons; and an interruption to the proceedings was occasioned by his hesitating to answer the questions put to him—first, on the ground that he was afraid of exposing himself to censure, as he had been already charged, in the House of Commons, with arrogance and contumaciousness in his mode of conducting himself on a previous examination; and, secondly, from apprehension of his evidence being turned against himself in a prosecution he was threatened with by the Commons. He subsequently complained that snares were laid for him in his examination—an expression which, Mr. Fox insisted, deserved the reprimand of the Court.

1788.

Correction of evidence by Major Scott.

Objection by Sir E. Impey to answer questions.

On the 22nd of May, Mr. Purling, who had acted as the Company's Resident at Lucknow, was examined by the Earl of Suffolk respecting the state of the province of Oude. Written evidence was presented, and Sir Elijah Impey corrected a discrepancy between evidence given by him before the House of Commons and his statements in a recent examination. He was further questioned, chiefly on the circumstances of taking the affidavits respecting the Begums' concern in the Benares insurrection. Capt. Jaques, the officer who had held the ministers of the Begums in his custody, during part of the time of their confinement, was called in, and gave evidence respecting the harshness of their treatment.

Examination of Mr. Purling.

Correction of evidence by Sir E. Impey.

Capt. Jaques.

Mr. Sheridan was stopped by Mr. Hastings' Counsel in an

1788. endeavour to elicit from the witness the contents of certain letters which he had received from the Resident at Lucknow, on the ground that he was putting leading questions to his own witness. Mr. Sheridan retorted that the witness could not be considered as the evidence of the Managers, as he was known to have been in close communication with the Counsel themselves.

Objection to leading questions.

On the 27th of May, Mr. Jaques was again examined. Subsequently, the Managers proposed to read from Mr. Middleton's letter-book his correspondence with Major Gilpin, by whom Capt. Jaques had been relieved at Fyzabad, but were opposed by Mr. Hastings's Counsel, who insisted that Major Gilpin ought to be called to prove the receipt of the letters. To this the Managers objected, as in that case Major Gilpin would be regarded as their witness, and they would thereby be debarred, by a former resolution of the Court, from putting what might be called leading questions to him. Eventually they submitted to the objection of the Counsel, and called in Major Gilpin to prove the letters in question. The Major was then examined by the Counsel, to prove the reality of the Begums' preparations to assist Cheyt Sing, and the respectful treatment they had subsequently received, when in confinement.

Instance of Counsel on calling witness to prove letters.

Major Gilpin.

Examination of Major Gilpin and Mr. Middleton.

Inaccuracies in printed Evidence.

Examination of Mr. Middleton.

On the 28th of May, after observations by Mr. Sheridan on incorrectnesses in the printed Evidence, Major Gilpin was again cross-examined by the Counsel. Mr. Middleton also was questioned as to the origin of the design of resuming the Begums' jagirs; and gave very material evidence on this subject.

On the 30th of May, the thirty-first day of the trial, Mr. Sheridan again brought forward the subject of inaccuracies in the printed Evidence, and proposed a plan for preparing a list of errata, which was accepted by the Counsel. Mr. Middleton was then subjected to an examination, principally concerning the treatment of the eunuchs, the ministers of the Begums, and alleged instructions from Mr. Hastings to induce the Nawab to give a present, after the treaty of Chunar. To many of the questions put



to him he refused answers, lest he might be criminating himself. On the conclusion of his examination, Mr. Sheridan informed the Court that the Managers had closed their evidence on the second charge.

On the 3rd of June, the thirty-second day of the trial, Mr. Sheridan proceeded to sum up the evidence on the charge relating to the Begums of Oude. His speech was continued through the 6th and 10th, and brought to conclusion on the 13th, of the same month. Excitement amongst the public was at its highest pitch on the first day of his great speech. Although the Court was not formed till twelve o'clock, it is stated that "by eight o'clock in the morning the avenues leading to the hall, through New and Old Palace Yards, were filled with ladies and gentlemen of the most respectable appearance, many of them peeresses in full dress, who stood in the streets for upwards of an hour before the gates were opened."\* He is stated to have been much exhausted at the end of the second day, and on the afternoon of the third day was suddenly interrupted by illness.†

Summing of evidence on the Second Charge by Mr. Sheridan.

\* "History of the Trial of Warren Hastings," Part I., p. 74.

† The general opinion of those who heard Mr. Sheridan's speech was, that, however splendid, it scarcely equalled his famous oration in the House of Commons, in bringing forward the same charge, on the 7th of February, 1787. If Mr. Burke, however, spoke his honest sentiments when he gave his opinion on the merits of the later speech, in a debate in the House of Commons, on the 6th of June—when only half of it had been delivered—it is not easy to conceive how it could have been surpassed by any effort even of the same wonderful genius. He said in reference to it,—“Every member had been struck dumb with astonishment and admiration at the wonderful eloquence of his honourable friend (Mr. Sheridan), who had that day again surprised the thousands who hung with rapture on his accents by such a display of talents as were unparalleled in the annals of oratory, and as did the highest honour to himself, to that house, and to his country.” . . . “Of all species of oratory, of every kind of eloquence that had been heard, either in ancient or in modern times, whatever the acuteness of the bar, the dignity of the senate, or the morality of the pulpit, could furnish, had not been equal to what that house had that day heard in Westminster Hall. No holy religionist, no man of any distinction as a literary character, could have come up, in the one instance, to the pure sentiments of morality, or, in the other, to the variety of knowledge, force of imagination, propriety and vivacity of allusion, beauty and elegance of diction, and strength of expression, to which they had all that day listened. From poetry up to eloquence, there was not a species of composition of which

1788. Mr. Sheridan's summing up of the evidence on the charge relating to the Begums closed the proceedings for that session of the Parliament. The trial had already occupied thirty-five days, extended over an entire session, and expressions of impatience were heard in the public press. The expense incurred by the prosecution was a subject of complaint; and, on the 9th of May, a direct motion was made by Mr. Burges, in the House of Commons, for a particular account from the solicitors to the Managers of the whole expenses of the prosecution. The debate which ensued gave rise to a very angry altercation between Mr. Burke and Mr. Pitt. In reference to an explanation offered by Mr. Pitt of certain communications between the Treasury and the Managers, Mr. Burke stated that his assertion was not true. Mr. Pitt replied, that, "perhaps, from being accustomed to use an extraordinary licence of speech elsewhere, Mr. Burke showed himself so much the slave of habit and practice that he forgot the place where he was, and seemed desirous of introducing that habit and practice within these walls." Mr. Burke retorted, that Mr. Pitt "had alluded to what he supposed to have passed in a place where he seldom or never made his appearance; but it was the curse of his situation to be surrounded with whisperers and tale-bearers, and to take up matters as they were conveyed to his ears by such reporters."\*

Close of the session of 1788.

Motion in the House of Commons for account of expenses.

Altercation between Mr. Burke and Mr. Pitt.

Further motions for accounts.

On the 20th of May, the accounts which had been called for were laid on the table of the House, and a second motion by Mr. Burges for a more particular account was carried, against the wish of the Managers, by a majority of sixty to seventeen. An effort was made on the 6th of June, by the same member, to induce the House to require a monthly account of expenses; but this was successfully resisted by the Managers.

---

a complete and perfect specimen might not have been culled from one part or the other of the speech to which he alluded."—Parliamentary History, vol. xxvii. col. 544.

\* See Parliamentary History, vol. xxvii. col. 493; and Adolphus' History of England, vol. vi. p. 149.

In the interval between the prorogation and the day appointed for the re-assembly of the Parliament, the exercise of the functions of royalty was interrupted by the King's illness. Shortly after the opening of the session, by commission, on the 3rd of February, 1789, a petition was presented to the House of Lords by Mr. Hastings, complaining of the great hardships to which the extraordinary duration of the trial was subjecting him. Amongst these, he mentioned the change of his judges by the decease of many members of the House; the detention of witnesses necessary for his defence, and the probability of his being deprived of many of them by various accidents; injury to his health, and waste of his fortune; that his expenses had already exceeded 30,000*l.*, and, consequently, that, should his life be continued to the close of the prosecution, he might find himself destitute of the means of defence and even of subsistence, and "run the dreadful chance of having his character transmitted on their records, blasted with unrefuted criminations;" and he prayed them to proceed on his trial without delay.\* Circumstances, however, prevented the immediate resumption of proceedings. The attention of the Legislature was for some time engrossed by the consideration of a Regency Bill. On the 19th of February, a notification was made to the House of Lords of the King's recovery, and the debates on the Regency were of course suspended. Adjournments from time to time succeeded, till proceedings were formally opened by the delivery of a speech in the King's name by the Lords Commissioners, on the 10th of March. The absence of the Judges on circuit still further delayed the resumption of the trial; and it was not till the 21st of April that the Court was again formed in Westminster Hall.

Session of  
1789.

Petition of  
Mr. Hastings to the  
House of  
Lords.

Delay in  
proceedings.

On that day, the thirty-sixth of the trial, Mr. Burke opened a portion of the sixth Article of the impeachment. The substance of the accusation contained in the Article

Mr. Burke's  
opening of  
part of the  
Sixth  
Charge.

---

\* Parliamentary History, vol. xxvii, col. 1344.

1789. was, that, contrary to his covenants with the court of Directors, as Governor General, and to terms of a special Act of Parliament, he had received various presents, from corrupt motives. That, in the year 1783, he took a present from Raja Nobkissen, under colour of a loan, to the amount of 34,000*l.*—That, in the year 1780, he accepted as a present, from Sadanund, the treasurer of Cheyt Sing, the sum of two lacs of rupees, equal to 20,000*l.*—That, in the same year, he took from a person called Kelloram a sum of four lacs of rupees, or 40,000*l.*, and, in consideration of it, granted to him and to Cullian Sing, in perpetuity, the farm of the revenue of the province of Behar.—That, in the year 1781, he accepted from Asoff-ud-Dowla, Nawab of Oude, being then in a state of great pecuniary embarrassment, the sum of ten lacs of rupees, equal to 100,000*l.*—That, in the same year, he took from a person called Nundulol, 58,000 rupees, equal to 5,000*l.*—That, in 1772 and the two following years, he extorted, by means of his banya, Cantoo Baboo, from the zamindar of Rajeshaye, divers sums, amounting to 4 lacs 40,000 rupees, equal to 40,000*l.*; and that, being charged with the same before the Supreme Council, he refused to clear himself from the accusation.—That, in 1773, he took from Raja Nundcomar and other persons divers sums, amounting in value to 40,000*l.*, as bribes for appointments; particularly for appointing Raja Goordass, son of Nundcomar, to the head of the finances of Bengal, and making Munny Begum, widow of Mir Jaffier, formerly Nawab of Bengal, superior of the family of Mobaric-ud-Dowla, the then Nawab, and constituting her minister of the government and guardian of the Nawab's minority, the said Munny Begum being wholly unqualified for the appointment.—That, in the year 1773, he took the sum of 36,000 rupees for himself, and 4,000 rupees for his banya, Cantoo Baboo, from one Khan Jehan Khan, out of his salary as faujdar of Hoogly, to which office he had appointed him; and that, when charged therewith by the majority of the Council, he refused to answer, and, moreover, prohibited the said

—  
Substance of  
the charge.

Corrupt  
presents.

Khan Jehan Khan from giving testimony respecting the 1789.  
transaction.

Mr. Burke selected for his opening the portion of the charge relating to the presents received from Munny Begum, in consideration, as was alleged, for the appointments of superior of the Nawab's household and guardian of his person; and introduced the circumstances of Nundcomar's accusation of Mr. Hastings, presented to the Supreme Council, in relation to these and other corrupt presents. He dwelt on the general corruption of the service by Mr. Hastings' example, and on the measures taken by him, in connection with the public accounts, for concealing his illegal practices. He prefaced his address with a notice of complaints, spread about by Mr. Hastings and his friends, of the length of the trial; in justification of which he cited, in comparison, the proceedings during the session of the Committee on the Colchester election, which had lasted as many days as the present trial. And he answered other complaints of the expenses to which Mr. Hastings had been driven by the nature of the proceedings, by asserting that they were more than covered by the amount of one of the bribes he should prove him to have accepted.

Mr. Burke's  
speech.

Mr. Burke's speech extended through the 25th of April and the 5th of May, and was concluded on the 7th of that month. The 22nd of April had been appointed for the second hearing of his address, but, after the Lords had met in the Hall as usual, Mr. Burke was seized with sudden indisposition, and the Court adjourned to the 25th. The speech bears the impress of the marvellous power and richness of the great orator's mind; and, while abounding in passages of the loftiest eloquence, never loses sight of its object of setting the circumstances of the charge distinctly before the Court, and heightening to the utmost every feature in the transaction to which guilt could be ascribed. But, in the course of the first day of its delivery, his earnestness of feeling led Mr. Burke into expressions not justified by the terms of the impeachment, and which brought upon

Charges  
Mr. Hastings with  
the murder  
of Nund-  
comar.

1789. him a serious mortification. In reference to the prosecution of Maharaja Nundcomar for forgery, and his eventual execution, at the very time when he was urging charges of bribery against Mr. Hastings before the Supreme Council of Calcutta, Mr. Burke said of Mr. Hastings, "Yet there is an action which is more odious than the crimes he attempts to cover; for he has murdered this man, by the hands of Sir Elijah Impey."\* On the 30th of April, when the Lords had met for a further hearing of the opening of the sixth Charge, a message was presented from the Commons desiring that the trial might be deferred to a future day. This interruption was occasioned by a petition of Mr. Hastings, which had been presented in the House of Commons on the 27th of April, by Major Scott, complaining of extraneous accusations, not included in the Articles of impeachment, and wholly false and unfounded, having been introduced by Mr. Burke into his speeches, and especially of his having charged him with the murder of Nundcomar; and praying that he might have an opportunity of answering these charges, or that the House would grant him redress. †

Proceedings interrupted by House of Commons.

Petition of Mr. Hastings to the House against unauthorised charges of Mr. Burke.

\* See page 47 of the present volume.

† The following are the terms of the petition:—"That the petitioner was impeached by this House, before the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled, on a charge of high crimes and misdemeanors, contained in certain Articles exhibited according to the just and proper usage of Parliament, and was required by the Lords to give in his answer to the same, a competent time being allowed him to prepare it, and which answer he delivered in accordingly; and that the Managers appointed by the House to carry on the prosecution, not confining themselves to the Articles of charge, which were especially exhibited against the petitioner, and to which he was required to deliver his answer, and had so answered as aforesaid, did, in the last year, introduce certain allegations in the course of their proceedings, which not only were not contained in, nor bore any immediate relation to, the said Articles of charge, but were wholly extraneous and foreign from them; although they were of such a nature as, if true, would have rendered the petitioner infinitely more criminal than anything contained in those which had been formerly exhibited against him; and that the allegations to which the petitioner more particularly alludes were as follows:—that he was concerned as an accomplice in a plot, alleged to have been formed for the purpose of assassinating the Shahzada, or Prince of Hindostan;—that he was concerned as an accomplice in procuring the death of Meeran, the son of the Nabob Jaffier Ally Cawn;—that he was the author and instigator of various acts of oppression and savage cruelty alleged to have been committed by a man named Deby Sing, under the appointment of the petitioner;—and that the trial, after an adjournment of upwards of ten months, was recommenced on the 21st instant, and the Article, intituled 'Presents,' opened by the Right. Hon.

The question of hearing the petition was supported by 1789. Mr. Pitt, and the subject of it was debated on in the House at several successive sittings. After it had been resolved that the petition should be received, Mr. Burke withdrew from the discussion; and a letter from him was read in the House, pledging himself to persist in the prosecution until he should be removed from the management by direct vote. A Committee was appointed to search for precedents as to the steps proper to be taken upon the petition, and Mr. Gurney, the short-hand writer, was examined in respect to the actual words uttered by Mr. Burke. It was eventually voted, on the motion of the Marquess of Graham, "That no direction or authority was given by this House to bring as a charge against Mr. Hastings, or to impute to him, the condemnation and execution of Nundcomar; and that the words spoken by Mr. Burke,—'he (meaning Mr. Hastings) murdered him (meaning Nundcomar) by the hands of Sir Elijah Impey,' ought not to have been spoken."\*

Vote of the House against the propriety of the charges.

In continuing his opening of the sixth Charge, on the 5th of May, Mr. Burke alluded at some length to these

Reference by Mr. Burke to

---

Edmund Burke, in the name of the Commons of Great Britain; and the said Right Hon. Manager, in like manner as in the preceding year, introducing many allegations foreign from the express charge, did, in direct terms, charge the petitioner with the horrid crime of murder, using the following words, 'He'—meaning the petitioner—'murdered that man'—alluding to Nundcomar—'by the hands of Sir Elijah Impey;'—that the said Right Hon. Manager, and the other members appointed by the House with him to be joint Managers of the prosecution, have at various times declared that they spoke by instruction from this House, whose representatives they were, and that they should allege nothing that they were not prepared and willing to prove;—that it would not become the petitioner to suppose that such allegations, so made, in the name and by the representatives of this House, were not made by the command of the House, although no charge containing them has been yet preferred against him. The petitioner, therefore, declaring that the above-recited accusations are all untrue and utterly unfounded, most humbly appeals to the justice of the House, and prays that such of them as properly fall within the immediate cognizance of the House may be brought forward, and prosecuted in specific Articles; and that, in respect of the rest of them, such other mode of prosecution may be directed, or other means adopted by the House, as may enable the petitioner to make the refutation of the several matters of grievous crimination as public as the charges themselves have been; or that the House will afford him such other redress in the premises as to the House shall seem meet."—Parliamentary History, vol. xxvii., col. 1364.

\* The numbers in the division were, Ayes, 135; Noes, 66; Majority 69.—Parliamentary History, vol. xxvii. col. 1422.

1789. proceedings, and with much dignity of language avowed the check he had received from the House of Commons, expressing entire submission to their resolution, yet reflecting on the readiness they had shown to overrule his judgment. He declared that, on the part of the Commons, he withdrew the imputation on Mr. Hastings of being concerned in the death of Nundcomar, but he reasserted it in his private character, and that in terms such as these:—"It was by the poverty of the language I was led to express my private feelings under the name of a murder; for if the language had furnished me, under the impression of those feelings, with a word sufficient to convey the complicated atrocity of that act, as I felt it in my mind, I would not have made use of the word murder."\*

proceedings  
in the House  
of Commons.

Re-assertion  
of the  
charge.

On the 7th of May and on the following court day, after the conclusion by Mr. Burke of his speech, various documentary evidence was read, on the part of the Managers, by Mr. Grey. Exception was taken by the Counsel for Mr. Hastings to the admission of a copy of a letter from their client to the Directors, the Managers having failed to find the original in the East India House; and the Counsel carried their point. An objection was subsequently raised by them to the reading of certain orders transmitted by the court of Directors to Mr. Hastings, requiring regular accounts to be kept of the expenditure of the Nawab of Oude's allowance; but they gave way, on the understanding that the evidence was to be hereafter expunged, if the Managers failed to prove its relevancy to the charge.

Production  
of evidence.

Objection to  
the copy of a  
letter.

Objection to  
orders of  
Directors.

On the 14th of May, the forty-second day of the trial, various papers were given in evidence, to show the character and position of Nundcomar; but the greater part of the day was consumed in a discussion on the admissibility in evidence of Nundcomar's examination on a paper of charges against Mr. Hastings, presented before the Supreme Council of

Objection to  
Nund-  
comar's  
paper of  
charges

---

\* Speech of Mr. Burke on opening the Sixth Charge.—Printed in the present volume, p. 116.



Calcutta in 1775; it being objected by the Counsel that 1789.  
 the examination was not taken upon oath, that it was taken  
 in the absence of Mr. Hastings, that it was a proceeding <sup>against</sup>  
 before an incompetent jurisdiction, and that Nundcomar <sup>Mr. Hast-</sup>  
 was afterwards convicted of a forgery, committed by him <sup>ings.</sup>  
 prior to the said examination being taken. The Lords  
 adjourned to the chamber of Parliament to discuss the  
 question.

At the opening of the Court on the 20th of May, the Lord <sup>Decision</sup>  
 Chancellor rose and announced the decision of the House of <sup>against</sup>  
 Lords that "it was not competent for the Managers to pro- <sup>Managers.</sup>  
 duce the examination of Nundcomar which they tendered  
 in evidence, the Managers not having proved, nor even  
 stated, anything as a ground for admitting such evidence,  
 which, if proved, would render the same admissible."

After a protest by Mr. Burke against this resolution, the <sup>The question</sup>  
 question was almost immediately re-opened, by a claim put <sup>re-opened.</sup>  
 forth by the Managers to produce the minutes of a consul-  
 tation of the Council of Calcutta of the 20th of March,  
 1775, when Mr. Hastings was present, in which were re-  
 hearsed the minutes of the previous Board, held on the 13th  
 of March, including the examination of Nundcomar.

The judgment of the Court was, "That the circumstance  
 of the consultation of the 13th of March, 1775, being read  
 at a consultation of the 20th of March, 1775, at which  
 Mr. Hastings was present, does not of itself make the matter  
 of such consultation of the 13th of March admissible  
 evidence."

The Managers remonstrated against this judgment, and, in  
 the discussion which ensued, the Lord Chancellor interpreted  
 the opinion of the Court in the following terms:—

"The examination of Nundcomar by itself is clearly no evidence at  
 all. To admit evidence which is incompetent, and which contains in it  
 criminal imputation against the Defendant, would be to admit unwar-  
 ranted slander." . . . "There is no way (as the argument alleges)  
 of making the paper competent evidence, but by proving that Mr. Hast-

1789. ings had done or said something, in reference to that paper, by which he had, in that act, made it competent evidence; and the Lords are of opinion that the circumstance of sitting by to hear it read is not such an act." \*

The argument was continued by Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke at great length. The Lord Chancellor again explained that, if the Managers could show that the evidence offered could apply, by connecting it with some criminal act done by the Defendant, they would be allowed to make use of it. After further arguments, delivered by Mr. Burke and Mr. Fox, the Court adjourned.

Decision  
against  
Managers.

On the following day, the 21st, the Lord Chancellor announced the decision of the Court "that the consultation of the 13th of March cannot now be read." After some remarks by Mr. Burke, the minutes of the 20th of March were read. From these it appeared that Cantoo Baboo had been ordered to attend the Council of the 13th of March, but had not obeyed; and had afterwards assigned, as his reason for not attending, an order from Mr. Hastings not to obey

Objection to  
other  
evidence  
bearing on  
the same  
subject.

the summons. Mr. Burke then again demanded that the minutes of the 13th of March might be read, as connected with this act of Mr. Hastings in interfering with the orders of the Council. A long discussion ensued, and the Court adjourned without having decided the question. In the interval between the adjournment and the next meeting, the

Question  
referred to  
the Judges.

Lords referred the question to the twelve Judges, whose answer was,—“That it is not competent for the Managers to produce an examination without oath, by the rest of the Councillors, in the absence of Mr. Hastings, the Governor, charging him with corruptly receiving 3,54,105 rupees,” etc. Accordingly, on the 27th of May, the Lord Chancellor announced the decision of the Lords,—“That the examination of Nundcomar and the proceedings of the rest of the Council, on the 13th of March, after Mr. Hastings had left the Council, ought not to be read.”

Decision  
against  
Managers.

---

\* Gurney's Report, MS.

Mr. Burke remarked upon the resolution of the Court in the following terms:— 1789.  
1789.

“My Lords, after hearing this determination of your Lordships, the ground and reasons of which we do not understand, nor can in the smallest degree conjecture, I must say that one great political purpose will be answered by that decision. Not only no Governor General of Bengal can be hereafter convicted of the offence of bribery, from the very nature and circumstances of the affair, but it will teach him to throw off all those guards of prudence which men use upon such an occasion: and that crime, which has hitherto been considered as essentially secret, will become public, notorious, and walk in the face of day. That greatest of all and basest of all guilt will appear with the face and mask of innocence. My Lords, I am only to say that a Governor General of Bengal cannot be betrayed, not only by his own guilt, but by the greatest impudence added to guilt. For, though he shall suffer the proofs of his guilt to be recorded upon the consultations and most solemn records of the Company, signed by his own hand, transmitted and authenticated by himself, and argued upon in his own defence, your Lordships are to know nothing of what the world knows but too much and feels but too well.”\*

After further observations of the same character, he asked permission to give in evidence a letter of Munny Begum, mentioned in the minutes, and charging Mr. Hastings with the receipt of money for the grant to her of the office of guardian to the Nawab of Oude, then a minor, arguing at great length on the propriety of its admission. The decision was referred by the Managers to the Lord Chancellor, who rejected the evidence. They then called Mr. Francis, as a witness to prove the delivery of the letter to the Council, but their questions were objected to and they suffered him to withdraw. Various papers were read in evidence, and the Court adjourned.

On the following day, the 28th of May, an objection by the Counsel of Mr. Hastings to admit as evidence a commission from the Council of Calcutta to Mr. Goring, to inquire respecting alleged embezzlements of the Nawab's revenue, under the administration of Munny Begum, was overruled. A long discussion ensued on the admission of the Begum's answers to queries drawn up by Mr. Hastings and

\* Gurney's Report, MS.

1779. proposed to her by the Council. The decision of the Court was again in favour of the Managers.

Various matters of evidence rejected.

June the 10th, the forty-sixth day of the trial, was occupied by unsuccessful efforts on the part of the Managers to obtain the admission of various matters of evidence, viz, a letter of Mr. Goring relating to the money received by Mr. Hastings from Munny Begum, under pretence of an entertainment; objected to as irrelevant:—the Persian original of the Begum's letter to the Council of Calcutta relative to the same transaction; opposed by the Counsel and rejected by the Court:—evidence by Mr. Goring of the delivery to him by the Begum of the same letter, with her acknowledgment of the presentation of the money to Mr. Hastings for his entertainment; similarly opposed and rejected:—lastly, a charge of bribery against Mr. Hastings by Raja Goordass, which Mr. Burke endeavoured to have read, by stating that the object was to infer from the demeanour of Mr. Hastings, when he was made acquainted with that charge, a proof of his guilt. The Lord Chancellor objected that the demeanour ought to be first proved. Mr. Burke termed the decision preposterous. Lord Kenyon remarked upon the expression as disrespectful to the house. Earl Stanhope vindicated Mr. Burke; who pacified the Court by explaining that he used the word as meaning "putting the cart before the horse."

On the 11th of June, every effort was made by the Managers to procure the admission in evidence of the translation of a letter from the Begum to Mr. Hastings, which had been delivered to the Select Committee of the House of Commons by Major Scott, and in which she affirmed the presentation to him of a lac and a half of rupees. At the close of the day the Lords adjourned to their chamber to consider their judgment, which was not delivered till the 17th of the month. It was in the simple terms that the letter ought not to be read.

An incident in the proceedings of the 11th of June deserves notice, as characteristic of the tone and temper

exhibited in the conduct of the trial. In the course of 1789. the altercations between the Managers and the Defendant's Counsel, Mr. Law asserted the principle, that, unless a prosecutor could establish his charges by evidence, they ought to pass for slander and calumny; and, having subsequently stated that he had the authority of the House of Commons for declaring that Mr. Burke had used slanderous and calumnious expressions, not warranted by his instructions from them, he explained that he was aware of their opinion by what had fallen from Mr. Burke himself, in his account in that Court of late proceedings in the House. This reflection on the conduct of the prosecution was caught up by Mr. Fox, who indignantly declared his determination not to proceed in the trial until the Court had expressed its opinion respecting Mr. Law's language; and the Managers were only at length quieted by a declaration of the Lord Chancellor that it was indecent to apply the terms slander or calumny to any thing that was said by authority of the House of Commons.

The remainder of the 17th of June, after the admission of a single paper, was occupied in an endeavour by the Managers to induce the Court to receive in evidence official accounts of sums given by Raja Goordass and Munny Begum to Mr. Hastings, as bearing on the fact of Mr. Hastings having reappointed them to their respective offices. The Lords withdrew to their own chamber at half-past two o'clock, and, after debating the point, drew up a question upon it, which they referred to the Judges, who, on account of its importance, desired time to consider their decision.

On the next day of the trial, the 24th of June, the Lord Chancellor announced the resolution of the House, that the accounts "ought not be read." Before proceedings were resumed, Lord Porchester proposed that two other questions, which he wished to read, should be referred to the Judges; but, as it was not according to form for the Lords to discuss such proceedings out of their own chamber, they immediately withdrew, and the trial was adjourned for six days.

Disrespectful expressions used by Mr. Law.

Question referred to the Judges.

1775

On the 29th of June, the Lords went into Committee to "inquire into the usual method of putting questions to the Judges and receiving their answers in judicial proceedings." After the reading of precedents and much debate, it was resolved, "That the proceedings on the trial of Warren Hastings, Esq., had been regular, and conformable to precedent in all trials of a similar nature."

Efforts to put in evidence a statement of the Begum's of presents made to Mr. Hastings.

The 30th of June was consumed in efforts made by the Managers to obtain the admission in evidence of a letter of Mr. Goring, containing accounts given by Munny Begum of presents made by her to Mr. Hastings. The first claim for its admission was grounded on the fact of its having been received and entered as read, and printed at length in the Appendix to the "Minutes of the Evidence," though an extract only had been actually read in Court and printed in the Minutes themselves. The decision of the Lords was, that "the papers printed in the Appendix, over and above what were actually read, have never been read, nor received by the House as read." The admission of the letter was subsequently urged by the Managers, because it formed part of a consultation which had already been read, and also because it had been rendered evidence by the demeanour of Mr. Hastings, who had requested the court of Directors to read and consider it. The Lords adjourned to their own chamber to consider their decision.

Decision against its admission.

Objection to evidence disproving the Nawab of Oude's sovereignty.

On the next day of the trial, the 2nd of July, the Lord Chancellor informed the Managers that "the letter of Mr. Goring, of the 29th of June, 1775, ought not to be read." Other documentary evidence was then put in by the Managers; but they were opposed in an attempt to read a paper, offered to disprove the Nawab of Oude's claim to be considered a sovereign prince, Mr. Hastings having justified his re-appointment of Munny Begum to the regency of that country by alleging the will of the Nawab, who had the right of appointing. The Lords, as usual, withdrew to their own chamber to discuss the arguments of either side.

On the next day of the trial, the 7th of July, the

decision of the Lords was announced, that the paper 1789. above referred to ought to be read. The remaining written evidence was tendered by the Managers in support of the first portion of the sixth charge, and admitted. Mr. Burke then stated that, as Mr. Hastings had asserted that the Begum's answers to queries transmitted to her by Mr. Hastings had been obtained by Mr. Goring in an unjustifiable manner, he desired to call Mr. Goring to prove that he had used no improper influence to procure the answers in question. Mr. Law objected that, as the Managers had produced the minutes entered by Mr. Hastings as evidence against him, these minutes ought to be considered as the witnesses for the prosecution, and therefore the Managers ought not to be allowed to disparage them by afterwards endeavouring to prove they were false. After hearing the arguments at length between the Managers and Counsel for the Defendant, the Lords withdrew for consideration of the question.

ag-  
objec. ...

Objection  
against dis-  
paraging  
their own  
evidence.

On the following day the Court again met, and the Lord Chancellor announced the decision of the Lords in the terms "that the question proposed to be asked of the witness by the Managers ought not to be put." Mr. Burke expressed the disappointment of the Managers at this resolution of their Lordships. He protested against it as tending to the utter subversion of all justice—

Supported  
by the  
Lords.

Protest of  
Mr. Burke.

"We proposed to your Lordships to prove Mr. Hastings guilty by showing the falsehood of the pretext which he made to cover his actions. Your Lordships permitted us to read the pretext, and we would have produced the evidence to prove the falsehood of this pretext. Your Lordships have refused us that: by which we stand in this unlucky circumstance, that we seem, *primâ fronte*, to have produced evidence against ourselves, whereas we produced only the pretext, in order afterwards to ground upon it the falsehood of that pretext. We are intercepted between the one and the other."

He concluded his observations by stating that it was not the intention of the Managers to adduce any further evidence, at present, upon the branch of the sixth Article he had opened.

After a short address from Mr. Law, complaining of the

“O. licence taken by Mr. Burke in protesting against the decision of the Court, and of its injurious effect upon his client, from its possible influence upon public opinion, as well as from its obstruction to the proceedings, Mr. Anstruther offered to begin his opening of the remainder of the Article. But the Parliamentary session was drawing to a close, and the Lord Chancellor proclaimed the adjournment of the trial to the first Tuesday in the next session. Before his Lordship had left the woolsack, Mr. Hastings claimed to be heard, and addressed the Court in the following words:—

Close of the session of 1789.

Mr. Hastings' address, 8th July, 1789.

“ My Lords, I feel myself unfit for the occasion which calls upon me to state to your Lordships what I feel of the unexampled hardships of this trial. I came here not prepared for such an event as I see is now impending. I beg that your Lordships will indulge me but for a few minutes while I recollect myself. I beg you will consider the situation in which I stand, as well as the awe which I must feel before such an assembly.

“ My Lords, I have already, in a humble petition, presented to your Lordships at the beginning of this year, stated the hardships and grievances, and but a part of the hardships and grievances, which I thought I should sustain when only one year of this impeachment had passed. Those, my Lords, have accumulated; many of them proportionably accumulated by the time which has since passed; but, in my sense of them, have been infinitely aggravated when I have seen so little done and so much time consumed; and yet not one tenth part of one single Article, out of twenty which compose the charge, has occupied your Lordships' time the last five months. And what period shall I estimate for the remainder of an impeachment, where so little has been done and so much time already consumed? My life is not sufficient, in any estimation of it, for a Parliamentary inquiry; and I do beseech your Lordships—I know not what to make the prayer of my petition; but I do beseech your Lordships to consider what my health—what my life—what my fortune—must sustain, if it should be your determination that I shall wait until it shall please the justice or the candour of the honourable House of Commons, which has impeached me before your Lordships, to carry on this prosecution.

“ My Lords, I hope I shall not be thought to deviate from the respect which I feel, I am sure, equally with any man living, for this very august assembly, if I say that, had a precedent been presented to me of a man impeached, as I have been, whose trial had been protracted to such a length, and to such a length as mine probably is to be protracted—if this had been put before my eyes, and I had seen the consequences to which I should have been exposed by such an impeachment—I pray



your Lordships will pardon me if I say I would have pleaded guilty. I would not have sustained the trial. I would rather have rested my cause and my character, dearer to me than life, upon that truth which sooner or later will show itself for the clearing my integrity, than have submitted to a trial which of itself would have proved a hundred times severer than any your Lordships could have inflicted upon me, had you tried me and found me guilty. Had I pleaded guilty, you could not have inflicted a punishment upon me more severe than that I experience by a life of impeachment. 1789.

“ I only beg to submit my case to your Lordships, that, if it is in your power to apply a remedy to the hardships I sustain and am sustaining, you will do it. I cannot propose anything so ungracious as that your Lordships should waste more of your time in the continuation of this trial, when so much of the year has passed, and when, by the custom of this country and the custom of Parliament, I believe, it has been always usual for the Lords to retire from the business of the session; and I do wish to submit myself to your Lordships’ justice and to your Lordships’ clemency. Yet, if the honourable Managers could propose a short time—a period such as your Lordships could give for the remainder of this impeachment, which, I have been told, perhaps falsely, was to end with the present Article of charge—I would rather waive my defence—I would rather pray your Lordships to proceed to judgment, even upon the evidence which they have adduced on the part of the prosecution only—than wait longer, to I know not what time, for the regular conclusion of it.

“ I hope I have said nothing which can be deemed disrespectful to the Court—I am sure I have felt nothing like it—and I submit myself.”\*

Whatever disposition might be felt by the House to meet the wishes of Mr. Hastings by continuing the proceedings over the usual period, the approaching absence of the Judges, on circuit, rendered this impracticable. Yet a paragraph appeared in a newspaper called “ The World,” complaining of want of spirit in the Lords, to put an end to the proceed-

Libel  
against the  
House of  
Lords.

---

\* To this address of Mr. Hastings the following answer was made by the Lord Chancellor.—“ Mr. Hastings, the Lords will certainly take into consideration everything of the sort that has been alleged on your part, and which can possibly be conducive to the justice of the case. You will recollect that this is not at the instance of the Managers at all, but merely with a view to see how the best justice can possibly be done; and, in any rule which the Lords can come to, they will undoubtedly entertain a full consideration of all those matters upon which the justice of the case ought to turn.”

Mr. Hastings—“ I rely with perfect deference upon your Lordship’s justice.”

1790.

ings. This was brought to the notice of the House of Commons by Mr. Marsham, and, on his motion, supported by Mr. Burke, it was voted a scandalous libel on the House, and a prosecution was instituted.

Resumption  
of the trial,  
16 Feb. 1790.

On the 16th of February, 1790, the fifty-fourth day of the trial, the Lords again entered Westminster Hall in formal procession, and prepared to resume the proceedings. Mr. Hastings having, as usual, been brought to the bar, on his knees, was permitted to rise; and Mr. Anstruther immediately commenced his Opening of the remainder of the sixth charge, on the subject of presents alleged to have been illegally received by Mr. Hastings. His speech, in which the facts of the case were very simply and effectively stated, occupied the day's sitting.

Mr. Anstruther's  
opening of  
the re-  
mainder of  
the sixth  
Charge con-  
cerning pre-  
sents.

Objections  
of irrelevant  
evidence  
overruled.

On the 18th and 23d of February, the Court was engaged in receiving written evidence, adduced by Mr. Anstruther, on the subject of that part of the charge he had opened. On each day, prolonged discussions arose between the learned Manager and Mr. Law, on objections made by the latter that the evidence referred to matters not charged in the impeachment. The judgment of the Lord Chancellor was in Mr. Anstruther's favour.

Examina-  
tion of  
Mr. Wright.

On the 25th of February, the fifty-seventh day of the trial, Mr. Wright, of the East India Company's Accountant's office, was examined on the comparative expenses of the old revenue establishment and that instituted by Mr. Hast-

Objection to  
evidence of  
the corrupt  
character of  
Kelleram.

ings. After which, Mr. Anstruther was proceeding to put in evidence to show the corrupt character of Kelleram, whom Mr. Hastings had appointed collector of Behar, and from whom he was charged with having received four lacs of rupees, equal to 40,000*l.*, but he was stopped by Mr. Law, on the ground that Kelleram's character and fitness for his office formed no part of the charge against Mr. Hastings. After a discussion, supported by Mr. Anstruther and, at great length, by Mr. Burke, on the one side, and by Mr. Law on the other, the Lords withdrew to their own chamber. In

about half an hour's time they returned, and the Lord Chancellor informed the Managers that they were restricted from giving evidence of the unfitness of Kelloram for his appointment, "the fact of such unfitness not being charged in the impeachment." Mr. Burke reflected with severity on their Lordships' judgment. He complained that the case determined on was not the case the Managers would have proposed. He asserted that "the Commons of Great Britain are not bound by any rules of pleading;" that, as laymen, they were ignorant of the doctrine of pleading, and could only be guided by rules of equity; that the proposed evidence was to prove aggravation of an offence charged, and that Mr. Hastings had a perfect knowledge that such aggravations would be charged against him. After the reading of further evidence the Court adjourned.

Objection allowed.

Mr. Burke's reflections on the Lords' decision.

The next sitting of the Court, which was not till the 22nd of April, was entirely occupied in arguments between the Managers and Counsel on the admissibility of evidence, to show that the lease granted to Kelloram by Mr. Hastings of the collectorship of Behar was injurious to the interests of the Company. The acceptance from Kelloram of the sum of four lacs of rupees had been admitted by Mr. Hastings; and it remained to show that he had received it from a corrupt motive. It was, therefore, important to the case to prove primarily that the lease was not a beneficial one for the Company; and they were prepared to show that Kelloram was in great arrears in his payments. The objection made to the evidence was, that what it was offered to prove was not made a matter of charge in the Article. The point was argued for a long time between the parties; and, at length, the Court was adjourned to the 27th, in order to give time to the Lords to consider their decision.

Question of admission of evidence of injury to the Company by Kelloram's lease.

On the Court reassembling, late in the day on the 27th, the Lord Chancellor announced that it "was not competent to the Managers to produce evidence to prove that Kelloram's rent was in arrear." Mr. Fox complained that the Court was peculiar in delivering its judgments without communi-

Decided against the admission.

Complaint by Mr. Fox of the Lords'

1790. cating the grounds on which they were formed; but was unable to elicit explanations from the Lord Chancellor, beyond the statement, "that the order of the House rejects the evidence as inapplicable to this charge." The examinations of witnesses was then proceeded with, and Mr. Hudson, of the India House, and Mr. Young, formerly a member of the Provincial Board of Revenue at Patna, were called. Several attempts were made by the Managers to elicit the fact of Kelloram's unfitness for the collectorship, which were with equal tenacity resisted by the Counsel; and, at length, a question put to Mr. Young by Mr. Anstruther, and leading in the same direction, having been objected to by Mr. Law, the Lords withdrew to consider their decision.

silence on the grounds of their decision. Examination of Mr. Hudson and Mr. Young.

Attempts to elicit Kelloram's unfitness for his office.

Decision against a question proposed by Managers.

Remonstrance of Managers.

Objection to evidence as referring to matters not in the charge.

Objection allowed.

On the 29th of April, the sixtieth day of the trial, the Court again assembled, and the Lord Chancellor announced the judgment of the Lords, that it was not competent to the Managers to put the question, "What impression the letting of the lands to Kelloram and Cullian Sing made upon the minds of the inhabitants of Behar." Again the system acted on by the Court, in announcing its decisions without explanation of the grounds they were formed on, was attacked by Mr. Fox, Mr. Windham and Mr. Burke, who professed themselves quite in the dark as to the principles on which their Lordships' judgment was founded. A statement was offered by Earl Stanhope, which only served to provoke further remonstrances. The examination of Mr. Young was continued, but was again interrupted by the objection of Mr. Law to a question, whether the country had been oppressed by Gunga Govind Sing, diwan to the Committee of Revenue in Calcutta. He urged that, although, at the end of the charge, the Commons had said—"to the great oppression and injury of the said people"—these words must be considered as inferences of law, and not substantive charges. A long argument ensued, and the Court adjourned without a decision.

On the 4th of May, the Lords resumed the proceedings, and their judgment on the question raised at their last

sitting was adverse to the Managers. After considerable consumption of time in altercations on the manner of putting a question to Mr. Young, this witness was ordered to retire, and Mr. Anderson, who had been the President of the new Revenue Board established by Mr. Hastings, was examined. 1790.  
—

Examina-  
tion of  
Mr. Ander-  
son.

On the 11th of May, the examination of Mr. Anderson was continued.\* Both this witness and the gentleman next or called, Mr. Moore, were examined respecting the character of Gunga Govind Sing. An attempt was made by Mr. Hastings' Counsel to injure Mr. Moore's credit, by making him state that he had been dismissed from his office; and much time was occupied, on this and the next court day, the 18th of May, in explanations on this subject. Or  
Mr. Moore.  
  
Attempt to  
discredit the  
witness.

The remainder of the sitting on the 18th of May was occupied in the examination of Mr. William Harwood, a gentleman who had held office in the revenue department. An effort was made by the Managers to go into evidence respecting the cruelties alleged to have been exercised by Deby Sing on the inhabitants of Dinagepore, and which had been detailed with terrible force by Mr. Burke in his General Opening of the prosecution. Their object was opposed by Mr. Hastings' Counsel. The Lords withdrew to consider the question raised; and, on their return, the Lord Chancellor informed the Managers "that it was not competent for them to give evidence of the enormities actually committed by Deby Sing, the same not being charged in the impeachment." On the announcement of their Lordships' decision, Mr. Burke remarked on the injury done to the cause by this exclusion of a charge in which Mr. Hastings' character was deeply concerned. Examina-  
tion of  
Mr. Har-  
wood.  
  
Objection to  
evidence of  
Deby Sing's  
cruelties.  
  
Objection  
allowed.

---

\* Much merriment was occasioned by the answer of this witness to the question in reference to an opinion expressed by him relative to a movement of troops, whether he was a military man: his reply being, "that he most certainly was not, though he had been two years in the militia." It is stated in the "History of the Trial," that "this high compliment to the military character of the militia raised a loud laugh in every part of the hall. Many of the peeresses joined heartily in it, looking at the noble Judges in the body of the Court, many of whom wore militia cockades."—Part III, p. 22.

1790. Much violent altercation ensued. Mr. Burke insisted on his ability to prove the atrocities he had described, and complained of being thwarted in his intention of bringing forward evidence upon them, adding that, "when the accusation was first made, the prisoner's Counsel called for proofs, and now when these are offered, they shrink from them and will not hear them." Mr. Law, with great warmth, retorted that the honourable Manager was bold only because he knew the proof which he spoke of could not be received, and exclaimed with violence, "I call upon your Lordships, for the honour of your Lordships and the justice of Great Britain, that the honourable Manager may couch all he has said in a charge, that Mr. Hastings may have an opportunity of meeting it; and, if he does not falsify every matter of cruelty that the Managers have repeated over and over again, may the hand of this House and may the vengeance of Almighty God fall heavy upon him!"\*

Remarks of Mr. Burke.

Mr. Law's challenge to the Managers to put Deby Sing's cruelties in the charge.

Objection to evidence falsifying a letter of Mr. Hastings.

On the 20th of May, the sixty-fourth day of the trial, after examination of an oral witness, the Court was engaged in hearing arguments, chiefly of Mr. Anstruther, on the admissibility in evidence of a letter of Mr. Hastings to the Directors, dated the 13th of April, 1781, and offered by the Managers as falsifying the contents of another letter from Mr. Hastings to the Directors, dated the 5th of May, 1781, and as showing that he had imposed upon them with respect to the appointment of the new Committee of Revenue, and that he had let the lands of the zamindars to men of unfit character. The Lords withdrew to consider their decision.

Objection allowed.

On the 2d of June, the Lord Chancellor announced their Lordships' judgment,—“that it is not competent for the Managers to give any evidence upon the seventh Article of impeachment, to prove that the letter of the 5th of May, 1781, is false, in any other particular than that wherein it is expressly charged to be false.” The remainder of the sitting

---

\* Gurney's Report of the Evidence, MS.; and "History of the Trial."

was occupied in examining witnesses and receiving written evidence submitted by the Managers. 1790.

On the two following court days, the 7th and 9th of June, Mr. Fox summed up the whole of the evidence; which had not been limited to the sixth Article, opened by Mr. Burke, but had been extended to a part of the seventh and the whole of the fourteenth Articles, bearing upon the same subject of illegal presents.

*Mr. Fox's summing of the evidence on the charge relating to presents.*

It is stated in the "History of the Trial," that "the hall was as much crowded this day as it had been through the whole of this important trial. Public curiosity was wound up to a higher pitch than on any former day, and every part of the hall was crowded to overflowing." On the conclusion of his speech the Court adjourned, and a message was subsequently sent from the Lords to the House of Commons that the trial was put off to the first Tuesday in the next session of Parliament.

The trial had now lasted sixty-seven days, and had extended through three sessions of Parliament. In this period, four only and part of a fifth, out of the twenty Articles of the impeachment, had been brought forward. Mr. Hastings' friends were loud in their complaints of the tediousness of the proceedings, and the heavy expenses he incurred in sustaining so prolonged a prosecution. Convinced of the impracticability of dealing with all the Articles with the same amount of care, and supporting them with the same fulness of evidence, the Managers had already resolved to apply to the House of Commons for authority to shorten future proceedings by abandoning such of the charges as they should see fit. On the 11th of May, Mr. Burke brought forward a motion in the House to this effect. He entered at large into a justification of the measure of impeachment. He spoke of the duration of the trial—that it had occupied sixty-three days, and, allowing an average of three hours to each day's sitting, they had spent one hundred and eighty-nine hours in Westminster Hall. He referred to

*Application by Managers to the House of Commons to drop parts of the charge.*

*Speech of Mr. Burke.*

1790. two petitions of Mr. Hastings complaining of the injuries he suffered from the length of the proceedings; and charged him with attempting to evade justice by impeding the proceedings in the trial, in order to gain time. To the resolution authorising the Managers "to insist only upon such and so many of the charges as shall appear to them the most conducive to the obtaining speedy and effectual justice against the said Warren Hastings," was added a second, pledging the House to persist in the impeachment until justice could be obtained. The latter resolution was objected to, but not opposed, by Mr. Pitt, and they both passed.

Letter of Major Scott reflecting on the Managers.

But the debates did not terminate with the passing of these resolutions. In reference to Mr. Burke's speech, in introducing them, a letter appeared in Woodfall's "Diary," of the 20th of May, signed by Major Scott, and in which he contradicted Mr. Burke's statement that Mr. Hastings' complained of having been put to an expense of three thousand pounds in procuring copies of papers at the India House, and charged Mr. Burke with reviving a calumny refuted a year ago. The letter further endeavoured to show that the length of the trial was owing to intentional efforts of the Managers to protract proceedings.

Voted libellous.

On the following day, the 21st of May, General Burgoyne brought this letter to the notice of the House. Major Scott was called upon to make his defence, which he immediately delivered at great length. Mr. Sheridan moved that the letter was a scandalous and libellous writing; but Mr. Pitt moved an adjournment, to allow time to consider the character of the letter.

Major Scott reprimanded.

On the 27th of May, the House resumed the debate, and Major Scott was allowed to add further remarks to his defence. Mr. Burke, Mr. Fox and Mr. Dundas, delivered their opinions, and the motion was carried without a division. It was further moved and carried that Major Scott had violated his duty as a member, and had been guilty of a breach of the



privileges of the House. It was then moved, that he "be reprimanded at the bar of the House by Mr. Speaker." An amendment to the terms of the motion was proposed by Mr. Pitt, by substituting "in his place" for "at the bar of the House," and, after a long debate, was assented to; and, on the 28th of May, Major Scott received the reprimand of the House through the Speaker.\* 1790. —

The dissolution of the Parliament having taken place after its adjournment, on the 9th of June, 1790, a new Parliament was summoned to meet on the 25th of November following. But the already slow pace of the proceedings in the trial was now reduced to a stand-still by a question affecting its very being; for it began to be freely discussed among Mr. Hastings' friends whether the impeachment had not abated by the dissolution of Parliament. Dissolution of Parliament. Question of abatement of the Impeachment.

On the 30th of November, before the address on the King's speech had been moved, Mr. Burke drew the attention of the new House to the importance of proceeding with the trial, and hinted at probable attempts to make the incident of the dissolution a pretext for stopping it. Motion of Mr. Burke for proceeding with the trial.

On the 9th, the 17th, 22d, and 23d of December, the House debated on the question of going into committee, to consider the state in which the impeachment was left at the dissolution of the last Parliament, a counter resolution having been moved, that a committee be appointed for the purpose of examining precedents. Mr. Erskine was the principal supporter of this proposition, and he evinced much research in his arguments to prove that the impeachment had either altogether abated or could not be resumed *in statu quo*. Mr. Addington, the Speaker, produced a book of precedents, collected from the best authorities, to prove the contrary principle, and Mr. Pitt spoke with great clearness and effect on the same side of the question. The number who voted against a committee to search for precedents was Its defeat.

\* See the "History of the Trial," Part III., pp. 24, *et seq.*

1790. 143 to 30. Although Mr. Burke took part in the debate, it was remarked that he left to Mr. Addington the labour of collecting precedents, and to Mr. Pitt the part of answering Mr. Erskine; but he privately stated that, though he was firm in his judgment and ready with precedents, he was desirous that Mr. Pitt's concurrence in his opinions should be generally known.\*

1791. On the 14th of February, after the recess, Mr. Burke moved for continuing the trial, and, as a preliminary measure, proposed—"that the Managers proceed no further than in the charges on which they have closed their evidence, except the charge relating to contracts, pensions and allowances." An effort was made by various members, including Mr. Jekyll and Mr. Ryder, who moved amendments on Mr. Burke's motion, to stop the trial entirely; but the original question was carried, after divisions on the amendments, of 54 to 194, and 79 to 161. The Managers were immediately reappointed to continue the prosecution.

Motion of Mr. Burke to abandon portions of the charge.

Defeat of amendments to stop the trial.

Question of the abatement discussed by the Lords.

But the question of abatement or non-abatement by a dissolution was not disposed of by the mere vote of the House of Commons. The decision lay with the House of Peers; and the subject was brought before them on the 17th of February by a message from the House of Commons, delivered by Mr. Burke, supported by Mr. Pitt, on his right hand, and Mr. Fox, on his left, and attended by more than one hundred members. The Lords were informed that the Commons had resolved to continue the impeachment, and they were desired to fix a day for resuming the proceedings. Lord Grenville immediately moved the appointment of a committee to examine the journals for precedents; which was ordered. The report of the committee was brought up on the 19th of April, and the debate upon it took place on the 16th of May, Lord Porchester moving "that a message be sent to the Commons to inform them that

Committee for precedents.

---

\* So stated by Mr. Adolphus in his "History of England," "from private information, and an unpublished letter of Mr. Burke," vol. vi., p. 165.

they (the Lords) were ready to proceed on the trial of Warren Hastings, Esq." The Lord Chancellor recommended that they should first consider whether the impeachment had abated or not. Lord Radnor moved to refer this question to the Judges. His motion was rejected by a majority of 70 to 20; and, after further debate, the original motion was carried by a majority of 66 to 18. The following Monday was fixed for proceeding to Westminster Hall.

Vote for continuing proceedings.

Accordingly, on the 23d of May, 1791, the sixty-eighth day of the trial, the Hon. Andrew St. John, on the part of the Managers, opened the fourth Article of the impeachment, relating to corrupt contracts and agencies, and illegal allowances. The Article charged Mr. Hastings in general terms that, in pursuance of a system of profusion and prodigality, and with a view to enrich his favourites and dependants, he entered into many contracts, without attention to repeated orders from the court of Directors to advertise them publicly; and that he "authorised and approved of many enormous salaries and extravagant allowances to his favourites." The particular charges were, in effect:—"That, in the year 1781, he granted to Stephen Sullivan, son of the Chairman of the court of Directors, a contract for the provision of opium for four years, without advertising for proposals, and upon extravagant terms, "for the purpose of creating an instant fortune to the said Sullivan;" and that the contract was transferred from party to party for large sums of money:—That, upon pretence that no purchaser had offered for the opium so contracted for, he advanced money to the contractor, and engaged in a smuggling transaction, in order to dispose of it in China, to the loss of the Company and the disgrace of the British character:—That, having, in the year 1777, accepted proposals for providing draft and carriage bullocks to the army for three years, without advertising for the same, he afterwards dissolved the contract, and entered into a new contract for five years with

Mr. St. John's opening of the Fourth Charge, relating to contracts.

Substance of the charges.

1791. his confidential friend, Charles Croftes, for the provision of a number of bullocks far exceeding the requirements of the army, and at a rate infinitely higher than the previous contract:—That the said contract for bullocks was extended to a sixth year, by the neglect of Mr. Hastings to give notice for its termination, as commanded by the Directors; and that he subsequently purchased the relinquishment of the contract at an extravagant price:—That, in the year 1779, with a view to increase his own influence, he created an establishment for Sir Eyre Coote, the Commander-in-Chief, at an expense of about 18,000*l. per annum*, and fastened the same upon the Nawab of Oude, contrary to treaties:—That, contrary to express orders of the Directors, in 1780, he, on his sole authority, continued large allowances to Sir Eyre Coote, to the extent of 21,654*l. per annum*:—That, in December 1780, he appointed James Peter Auriol to be agent for the purchase of supplies to the different Presidencies, at a time of scarcity, with a commission of fifteen *per cent.*, the usual commission being only five *per cent.*:—That, in 1776, he induced the Council to create an unnecessary appointment of an agent for the supply of stores for the garrison of Fort William, and nominated to it his confidential friend John Belli; that he procured him a commission of thirty *per cent.*, and, afterwards, converted the agency into a contract for five years.

Immediately on the conclusion of Mr. St. John's opening speech, Mr. Hastings rose and addressed the Court in the following words:—

“ My Lords, I shall take but a very few minutes of your Lordships' time, but what I have to say I hope will be deemed of sufficient importance to justify me in requesting that your Lordships will give me so much indulgence.

“ A charge of having wasted 584,000*l.* is easily made where no means are allowed for. It is not pleasant for me, my Lords, from week to week, from month to month, and from year to year, to sit here to hear myself accused of crimes, many of them of the most atrocious dye, and all represented as such, and to feel that I never shall be allowed to

answer them. My Lords, in the life of a man already approaching very near to the close of it, as mine does, four years, in which his reputation is to be branded to the world, is too long a period. I never expect to be allowed to come to my Defence, nor to hear your Lordships' judgment upon the trial. I have long been convinced of it. Nor has the late resolution of the House of Commons, which I expected to have heard announced to your Lordships here, afforded me the least glimpse of hope that the termination of my trial is a bit the nearer. My Lords, it is now four years complete since I first appeared before your Lordships' bar. Nor is this all. I came, my Lords, to your bar with a mind sore from another inquisition in another place, which commenced—if I may be allowed to date it, because I had that impression upon my mind which obliges me to do it, I may date it from the day on which I arrived in this capital upon my return to England, after thirteen years service. On that day was announced to the House of Commons the determination of arraigning me for the whole of my conduct during my government. I have been now an accused man during six years. I now approach very near—I do not know whether my recollection fails me, but I believe I am now sixty years of age; and, my Lords, can I waste my life in sitting here to hear myself from time to time arraigned—not only arraigned, but tortured with invective of the most atrocious and virulent kind? I appeal to every man's feelings whether I have not borne more than many even of your Lordships would bear, and with a patience that nothing but a consciousness of my own integrity and respect for your Lordships could have enabled me to bear.

“ My Lords, as the House of Commons have declared their resolution that, for the sake of speedy justice—I think that was the term—they have ordered their Managers to close their prosecution with the Article which has now been opened to your Lordships and to abandon the rest, I now see a prospect, which I never saw before, but which it is in your Lordships' power to realise, of a close to this disgraceful situation in which I have been so long placed; and, however I may be charged with the error of imprudence, I am sure I shall not be deemed guilty of disrespect to your Lordships in the request I have to make. That request is, that your Lordships will be pleased to grant me that justice which every man in every country in the world, free or otherwise, has a right to—that where he is accused he may defend himself—that where he is accused he may have the judgment of the Court upon the accusation. I, therefore, do pray your Lordships, notwithstanding the time of the year—I feel the weight of that reflection upon my mind—but I pray your Lordships to consider, not the unimportance of the object that is before you, but the magnitude of the precedent, which every man in this country may bring home to his own feelings, of a criminal trial suspended over his head for ever. Every man may be liable to that trial which I now sustain, but, in the history of the jurisprudence of this country, I am told—and I have taken some pains to search, and as far as my search can go it has been verified—there never yet was an instance of a criminal trial that lasted

1791. four months, before mine, nor even one month, excepting in one instance—an instance drawn from a time and from a situation of this government which I hope will prevent it ever being drawn into a precedent for this or for any enlightened time. My Lords, the request that I have to make is, that your Lordships will be pleased to continue the sitting of this Court until the prosecution shall be closed, I shall be heard in my defence, and your Lordships shall have proceeded to judgment. My Lords, it is not an acquittal that I desire—that will rest with your Lordships and with your own internal conviction—I desire a defence, and I desire a judgment, be that judgment what it may.

“ My Lords, I have humbled myself before this Court, and have been reproached. I am not ashamed to bow before an authority to which I owe submission, and for which I feel a respect that exacts it as a willing oblation from me. I now again with all humility present myself an object to your justice and to your humanity; for I am not a man of apathy, nor are my powers of endurance equal to the tardy and indefinite operation of Parliamentary justice. I feel it as a very cruel lot imposed upon me, to be tried by one generation and, if I live so long, to expect judgment from another. For, my Lords, are all the Lords present before whom I originally stood? Are not many gone to that place to which we must all go? I am told that there is a difference of more than sixty in the identity of the judges before whom I now stand.

“ My Lords, I pray your Lordships to free me from this state of unexampled suspension. I again repeat my request that you will be pleased to resolve to continue this session of your Lordships' Court until the prosecution shall be closed, until I shall be heard in my defence, and until your Lordships shall have proceeded to judgment. If your Lordships shall please, I have drawn up a petition to that effect, in form, which I am very desirous of presenting now, or in any other manner which your Lordships shall think proper to order.”\*

---

\* The petition was as follows :—

“ To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in  
Parliament assembled:

“ The humble Petition of Warren Hastings, Esq., late Governor General  
of Bengal.

“ Sheweth,—

“ That your Petitioner, having long waited in anxious expectation of your Lordships' determination respecting his reappearance at your Lordship's bar, finds himself relieved from one source of suspense, by being again brought before this high court; and he has so great a confidence in the justice and dignity of your Lordships as to believe that, in this renewal of a trial so long depending, your Lordships mean to render it effectual to the ends of substantial justice, by prosecuting it without delay, until it shall reach its final termination. If such should be your Lordships' purpose, your Petitioner will accept it as the greatest bounty which he can receive at the hands of your Lordships; but, should his trial be adjourned over to another year, he trusts that he shall not be considered as departing from the respect which he bears to your Lordships, if he presumes to say, that he shall feel it as an aggravation of the very severe lot which it has been his misfortune to experience, and of which he is the first example in the jurisprudence of this kingdom, if in any other a precedent can be found, of a criminal trial being suspended over the

Mr. Burke rose immediately on the conclusion of this address. He protested against the imputation that the Managers had interposed delays in the proceedings. He justified the severity of language used by the Managers, by instancing the impeachment of Lord Macclesfield, who, he said, was charged with bribes, not with cruelty, while Mr. Hastings was "charged with horrors"—with the worst of crimes—with murders; and he offered to go on with the trial if the Crown should be induced to prolong the session till it could be completed. Mr. Fox also made some observations on the

1791.

—  
Mr. Burke's  
justification  
of the con-  
duct of the  
Managers.

head of an individual, living under a fixed law and a civilised government, during so long a period of his natural life, and so near the close of it.

"That four years are completely elapsed since your Petitioner was first compelled to appear at your Lordships' bar, to hear read and to answer to the charges preferred against him by the late Honourable House of Commons; but that he computes the origin of their impeachment from a much more distant date, the first notification of an accusatory process having been made so long ago as June, 1785, the process itself begun in February, 1786, and continued through one prorogation and many adjournments until May, 1787, when the impeachment was carried to your Lordships' bar; so that, in effect, though not in form, your Petitioner has been the subject of a criminal process before two Parliaments and through six successive years; yet his prosecutors to this time have closed their evidence upon three Articles only, namely, the first, second and sixth, omitting many points of those Articles, but selecting a very few points from the 7th and 12th, as explanatory of the sixth Article. That your Petitioner craves leave to represent that he did, in an early stage of the first inquiry, cause it to be represented to the late Honourable House of Commons, as his earnest request, that, if the said House of Commons should enter upon their journals any vote of crimination or censure against him, they would be pleased to allow your Petitioner the means of a fair and legal trial for the same; but that the object of your Petitioner, in making that request was, that he might be afforded the means of vindicating his character from the foulest and most unjust aspersions; but he has to lament that those aspersions should have been renewed and repeated from week to week, from month to month, and from year to year, without any power of reply or prospect of time allowed him for his defence and acquittal. That, great as his reliance is on your Lordships' justice, it is yet impossible for him, judging from past experience, not to feel the apprehensions of further delay, when he recollects that the last great adjournment of the Court, held by your Lordships in the preceding Parliament, was made on the 9th of June, and that in neither of the preceding years did it sit later than the 7th of July; that, therefore, the longest interval which he can compute for what remains of this session of Parliament, in its ordinary course, will be insufficient to enable your Petitioner to enter upon his defence, much less to bring it to a conclusion; but that he will have to sustain the intolerable grievance of seeing another year of prosecution added to the past.

"Your Petitioner, therefore, most humbly and earnestly prays your Lordships to take the particular and unprecedented hardships of his case into consideration, and to adopt such measures as your wisdom may devise for continuing the proceedings of your Lordships' Court, so that the trial may be brought to a close, and judgment given, before another prorogation of Parliament; your Petitioner craving leave to assure your Lordships that no unnecessary delay shall be made on his part, but that he will endeavour to take up as short a time as possible in his defence."

1791. statements of Mr. Hastings, who disavowed any intention of charging the Court "with injustice, or with being in any degree the cause of the delays which have happened."

Production of evidence on the Fourth Charge.

Summing of the evidence by Sir J. St. Clair, and close of case for the prosecution.

General defence read by Mr. Hastings.

Close of the session of 1791.

The 25th and 27th of May were occupied in the production of evidence, oral and written, on the charge relating to contracts, with occasional interruptions by the exceptions taken by Mr. Hastings' Counsel. On the 30th of May, the seventy-first day of the trial, Sir James Erskine St. Clair summed up the evidence, and the case for the prosecution was closed. At the conclusion of the Manager's speech, Lord Kenyon, who presided as Speaker, intimated to Mr. Hastings that he was at liberty to make his defence; and, at Mr. Hastings' request, the Lords consented to grant him a hearing on the following Thursday. Accordingly, on the 2nd of June, the seventy-second day of the trial, Mr. Hastings read at the bar of the Court a general defence of his administration of India, and an answer to the several charges that had been brought against him. He offered to forego the advantage of a more particular defence, in the expectation of drawing from his judges an immediate verdict, but reserved to himself the right of a formal defence by his Counsel should he be disappointed in that hope.\* After hearing his address, the Court adjourned to the first Tuesday in the next session of Parliament.

1792. At the assembling of the Court, on the 14th of February, 1792, the seventy-third day of the trial, Mr. Law commenced his general opening of the Defence, in a speech of great power, which he continued on the 17th, and finished on the 21st of the month.

Mr. Law's general opening of the Defence.

Mr. Plumer's opening of the Defence on the First Charge.

On the 23d of February, and the four succeeding court days, the 29th of February, the 1st of March, the 24th and 26th of April, from the seventy-sixth to the eightieth day of the trial, Mr. Plumer engaged the attention of the Court in an elaborate and lucid defence on the first Article of the impeachment. His speech closes the present volume.

---

\* Mr. Hastings' Defence is printed in the present volume, p. 482.



## REPORTS OF THE

Reports of the several speeches contained in the present volume have been accessible to the Editor in the following forms. Excepting Mr. Hastings' Address, all the speeches have been printed from Gurney's Notes.

I. *Burke's Opening of a portion of the Sixth Charge, on the 21st and 25th of April, and 5th and 7th of May, 1789.* 1. Gurney's contemporaneous report. 2. The same, revised by Mr. Burke, and printed among his works.

II. *Anstruther's Opening of the remainder of the Sixth Charge, on the 16th of February, 1790.* Gurney's Report. Besides the copies of this report in the Editor's hands and in the Library of Lincoln's Inn, another is preserved in the British Museum, Additional MS., 17,076, f. 70.

III. *Fox's Summing of the Evidence on the Sixth, part of the Seventh, and the Fourteenth Articles of the Charge, on the 7th and 9th of June, 1790.* Gurney's Report.

IV. *St. John's Opening of the Fourth Charge, on the 23d of May, 1791.* 1. Gurney's Report. 2. Fragment of the Report of Mr. Hastings' short-hand writer, for the seven first pages of the speech, in the British Museum, Additional MS. 17,073, f. 1.

V. *St. Clair's Summing of the Evidence on the Fourth Charge, on the 30th of May, 1791.* Gurney's Report.

VI. *Hastings' Address, on the 2d of June, 1791.* 1. Gurney's Report. 2. Report of Mr. Hastings' short-hand writer, formerly in the possession of Mr. Hastings' solicitors, and now in the British Museum, Additional MS., 17,073, f. 102. 3. Copy, apparently, of the notes from which Mr. Hastings' read his Address; printed in the "History of the Trial," Part IV., p. 81, and which is followed in the present publication.

VII. *Law's General Opening of the Defence, on the 14th, 17th and 21st, of February, 1792.* 1. Gurney's Report.

2. The same with occasional alterations, formerly belonging to Mr. Hastings' solicitors, and now in the British Museum, Additional MS., 17,077, f. 1.

VIII. *Plumer's Opening of the Defence on the First Charge, on the 23d and 29th of February, the 1st of March, and the 24th and 26th of April, 1792.* 1. Gurney's Report.

2. The same with alterations, formerly in the possession of Mr. Hastings' solicitors, and at present in the British Museum, Additional MS., 17,078, f. 1.

# CONTENTS OF THE SPEECHES

## CONTAINED IN VOL. II.

### SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE, MANAGER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN OPENING THE SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO PRESENTS; 21ST APRIL, 1789.

Delay occasioned by the King's illness, 1;—Homage done to the Deity by executing justice, 2;—Complaint of cost of proceedings, 3;—Weariness of the public, 4;—Testimonials in favour of Mr. Hastings, 5;—Their worthlessness, 6;—Testimonial of Radanaut, 7;—Bribes taken from him, 8;—Subject of the present Charge, bribes from natives of India, *ib.*;—Corrupt contracts, 9;—Connivance of the whole service, *ib.*;—Bribes received through banyas, 9;—System of corruption, *ib.*;—Contrast between the present and previous charges, 10;—Low vices in high stations, *ib.*;—Objects of present address, 11;—Early practice of bribery in India, 12;—Minute of Lord Clive, *ib.*;—Means taken by the Directors to check it, 14;—Covenant against taking presents, 15;—Act of Parliament, *ib.*;—Presents a custom in the East, *ib.*;—Various kinds of presents, *ib.*;—The *Nazr*, 16;—Prohibition of presents, *ib.*;—Ample provision for the Governor General, 17;—Allowance fixed by the Council, *ib.*;—Amount of emoluments, 18;—Mr. Hastings' admission of sufficiency of the allowance, *ib.*;—His corruption, 19;—Growth of corruption in the service, *ib.*;—Instructions to him to correct abuses, *ib.*;—Disorders in 1772, 21;—Minority of the Nawab of Bengal, 21;—Order for arrest of Mohammed Reza Khan, 22;—Offices held by him, *ib.*;—Order of the Directors to supply office of guardian of the Nawab, 23;—Order for reduction of Nawab's allowance, *ib.*;—Congruity of evidence with character of Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Alacrity in executing order for arrest of Mohammed Reza Khan, 24;—His detention without trial, 25;—Displacement of his adherents, *ib.*;—Motives of Mr. Hastings, 26;—Concealment from the Council, 27;—Employment of Mohammed Reza Khan's enemy, Nundcomar, *ib.*;—Arrest of Shitab Roy, 28;—Necessity for caution in filling up Mohammed Reza Khan's place, 29;—Appointment of a woman to his office, 30;—History of Munny Begum, 31;—Placed by Mr. Hastings in Mohammed Reza Khan's office, 32;—Inference of corruption, 33;—His rejection of more suitable persons, *ib.*;—False plea of economy, 34;—Directors' order for account to be kept by the Nawab's guardian, 35;—Not

enforced by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Order for reduction of the Nawab's allowance, 36;—Payment of full allowance by Mr. Hastings, 38;—Reflections, *ib.*;—Charges against Mr. Hastings by Nundcomar, 39;—Include a bribe of two lacs from Munny Begum, *ib.*;—Duty of the Council to investigate the charge, 40;—Inquiry not instituted by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Letter of Nundcomar, 41;—Specific character of his charge, *ib.*;—Conduct of Mr. Hastings, 42;—His minute, prohibiting examination of Nundcomar, 42;—His objection to the Council as his judges, 45;—His denunciation of Nundcomar's character, *ib.*;—Previous extolment of it, 46;—High position of Nundcomar, 47;—Murder of Nundcomar imputed to Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Character of Nundcomar by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—The Council justified in crediting Nundcomar, 49;—Employed by Mr. Hastings in prosecuting Mohammed Reza Khan, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' consideration for his dignity in declining the inquiry, 50;—Reservation of his defence for a court of justice, *ib.*;—His dissolution of the Council, 51;—Persistence of the Council in the inquiry, *ib.*;—**Letter of Munny Begum instructing Nundcomar as to the bribes, *ib.*;—Amount of the bribes, 52;—Cantoo Baboo summoned before the Council, *ib.*;—Ordered by Mr. Hastings not to attend, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' prosecution of Nundcomar for conspiracy, *ib.*;—Proofs of the bribe of two lacs, 53;—Proof of payment of one and a half lac, *ib.*;—Endeavour to confound the two bribes, 54;—Inquiry from Munny Begum instituted by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Donation of one and a half lac admitted by her, 55;—Evidence of the bribe of two lacs, 56;—Proof from an account delivered by Munny Begum, *ib.*;—Promise of a syllabus of the evidence in the present charge, 57;—Custom of entertainment put forth as a screen, 58;—Circumstances under which the entertainment was given, *ib.*;—Object of Mr. Hastings' visit to retrench expenses, *ib.*;—Withdrawal of pensions from the nobility, 59;—The transaction not denied by Mr. Hastings, 60.**

CONTINUATION OF THE SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE, MANAGER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN OPENING THE SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO PRESENTS; 25TH APRIL, 1789.

Extent of bribe from Munny Begum, 63;—Resistance of Mr. Hastings to inquiry, *ib.*;—Declares he reserves his defence, 64;—Urgency of reasons for explanation of his conduct, 65;—Minuteness of Sir J. Clavering charging him with peculation, *ib.*;—Passiveness of Mr. Hastings under the charge, 66;—Conduct of Sir J. Clavering approved by the Directors, *ib.*;—Weight of accusation against Mr. Hastings, 68;—Persistence in resisting inquiry when in the majority in the Council, *ib.*;—His reasons for reserving his defence, 69;—His submission to infamy, *ib.*;—Obligation to the Company to account for his conduct, 70;—Reservation of defence for a court of justice a proof of guilt, *ib.*;—Prosecution not attempted in Bengal, 72;—Mr. Hastings' reliance on an opinion of Counsel referred to by the Directors, *ib.*;—Doubtful character of their opinion against his prosecution, 74;—Bias of

the solicitor of the Company in his favour, *ib.*;—Falsification of the case in the report upon it, 75;—Reflections on the Company's conduct of their prosecutions, 78;—Obligation on Mr. Hastings to clear himself to the Directors, 79;—Opinion of Mr. Sayer on Mr. Hastings' conduct, 80;—Silence under suspicion, 81;—Justification of receipt of money as a present for entertainment, *ib.*;—Abuse of the custom, 82;—Prohibition of presents by the Company, 83;—Concealment of the present, *ib.*;—Not intitled to the present, *ib.*;—Plea of its covering other charges, 84;—His travelling expenses charged, *ib.*;—Danger of encouraging presents for entertainment, 85;—Recapitulation, 86;—Further presumptions of criminality, *ib.*;—Directors' orders for the employment of Mohammed Reza Khan, 87;—His restoration by the Council, *ib.*;—Opposition of Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Confirmation by Directors, 88;—Mohammed Reza Khan deposed by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Distribution of his salary to Munny Begum and others, *ib.*;—Appointment of Raja Goordass, 89;—The Nawab's family placed under the control of Munny Begum, *ib.*;—The Nawab a puppet in Mr. Hastings' hands, *ib.*;—Letters of the Nawab praying to be placed under the guardianship of Munny Begum, 90;—Munny Begum invested with supreme authority, 92;—Evil influence of the ministers of Munny Begum, 93;—Order from Mr. Hastings to the Nawab not to interfere with the faujdari, 94;—General corruption of the country, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings induced by fear of disclosure of his bribes to support the Begum, 95;—No account required of Munny Begum by Mr. Hastings, 96;—Censure by the Directors of Mr. Hastings' appointments, *ib.*;—He pretends to refer to the Nawab the Directors' order to restore Mohammed Reza Khan, 98;—Rejection of the order by the Nawab, 99;—Support of Mohammed Reza Khan by Mr. Francis, *ib.*;—The Nawab makes the appointment at Mr. Hastings' dictation, 100;—Private assurance to the Nawab that the appointment should be rescinded, *ib.*;—Mohammed Reza Khan removed from office, *ib.*;—Inference of corruption, 101;—Corruption of the service consequent on Mr. Hastings' bribery, *ib.*;—His excuses to the Directors for not inquiring into corrupt practices in the service, 102;—His connivance in abuses, 104;—Prosecutions ordered by the Directors, 105;—Abandoned by Mr. Hastings, 106;—Mr. Hastings' recommendation of a pension to Munny Begum, *ib.*;—His constant support of the Begum after receiving the bribe in 1772, 108;—His sale of the offices of the country, *ib.*

CONTINUATION OF THE SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE, MANAGER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN OPENING THE SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO PRESENTS; 5TH MAY, 1789.

Reference to a vote of the House of Commons censuring his imputing the death of Nundcomar to Mr. Hastings, 109;—Confidence of the House, 110;—Indiscretion in the conduct of the prosecution to be attributed to himself, not to the Commons, 111;—Resolution of the Commons, disavowing the charge against

Mr. Hastings respecting the death of Nundcomar, 112;—Apology for having exceeded the terms of the impeachment, 113;—The charge of bribery founded on Nundcomar's evidence, *ib.*;—Coincidence of his prosecution with his accusation of Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Proof from Mr. Hastings' Defence before the Commons of his purpose to blacken the character of Nundcomar, 114;—Object of Mr. Burke to support Nundcomar's character, 115;—Persistence in the charge in his own judgment, 116;—The term murder used in the moral not the legal sense, *ib.*;—His opinion on the subject the result of many years consideration of the evidence, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' charge of malice in imputing to him the prosecution of Nundcomar, 117;—Defence of Nundcomar from Mr. Hastings' charge of forgery of a letter, 118;—Resumption of the charge against Mr. Hastings, 120;—Extensive system of bribery, *ib.*;—Second period of the bribery, 121;—His scheme for acquiring revenue for the Company by privately taking moneys, *ib.*;—Act of Parliament prohibiting bribery, 122;—Orders of the Directors to the same effect, *ib.*;—Clause allowing open receipt of presents for the Company's use in certain cases, 123;—Abused by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Fraudulent system of accounts, 124;—Letter of Mr. Hastings, declaring the stringency of the Act in regard to a donation to the troops, 125;—The particular case justified a favourable construction of the Act, 127;—Money taken by Mr. Hastings himself under pretence of applying it to the Company's use, *ib.*;—Case of 20,000*l.* kept back by Gunga Govind Sing, 129;—Attempted concealment of a bribe received from Cheyt Sing, 131;—Offer of Mr. Hastings of an advance of two lacs of his own money, *ib.*;—Subsequent avowal, that the money belonged to the Company, *ib.*;—His concealment of the source of receipt of the money, 132;—Two-thirds of the money given his own, and one-third the Company's, 133;—His subsequent claim of the whole money, and bonds taken for it, 134;—In a third account it is represented as the Company's money, 135;—Further fraudulent account respecting bonds, *ib.*;—His explanation of these contradictions, 136;—Present from the Nawab of 100,000*l.*, *ib.*;—His announcement of it to the Directors, *ib.*;—Asks a donation of it from the Directors, *ib.*;—Refusal of the Directors, 137;—Hr. Hastings letter, acknowledging the present, sent to the Directors by an agent, 138;—His concealment of the persons from whom the presents were received, *ib.*;—Delay in giving an account of the present to the Directors, *ib.*;—Mention made by him of other sums received, 139;—Concealment of his transactions by means of the Company's accountants, 141;—Interval between the payment of the money into the hands of the accountant, and entry of it in the accounts, 142;—His various deceptions in regard to the sums received by him, 143;—Letter of the 22nd of May, offering explanations, *ib.*;—No mention made of the channels through which the money was received, 144;—Letter of the 16th of December explaining the delay in sending that of the 22nd of May, 145;—Claim of credit for acknowledging his bribes, 146;—Pretended avowal of his bribes, 147;—His resentment at the Directors requirement of an account, *ib.*;—Threatens to appropriate the sums already past to their credit, 148;—His power of altering the Company's accounts, *ib.*;—Absence of explanations in the letter of the 16th

of December, 149;—Discovery of another bribe in September, 1784, *ib.*;—He insists upon being allowed to retain it, 150;—Conceals the givers of the bribe, 151;—Discovery made by Parliamentary investigation, 152;—Explanation given in his Defence in the House of Commons, *ib.*;—Three lacs received from Raja Nobkissin, *ib.*;—System of false accounts, 153;—Letter to the Directors, desiring to apply the money to account of contingent expenses, *ib.*;—Improbability in the account of the pretended loan from Nobkissin, 154;—Acceptance of the money, 155;—The management of a district given to Nobkissin, *ib.*;—The persons bribing Mr. Hastings suffered to remain in arrears, 156;—Nobkissin a defaulter, *ib.*;—Demand of Directors for a precise account of the presents received, 157;—Mr. Hastings returns to England without having answered the letter, *ib.*;—Letter to him from the Directors after his arrival in England, *ib.*;—His answer from Cheltenham, 158;—Admission of inaccuracy in his account, 160;—Refers to the Accountant General in Bengal, *ib.*;—Studied obscurity of language, 161;—Concealment of the persons he received presents from, 162;—Motive for concealing them from his colleagues, *ib.*;—Oath imposed by him on the Committee of Revenue not to take presents, 163;—His reasons for concealing his receipt of presents from the Board of Revenue, 164;—Reasons for entering the sums as a deposit, 165;—Subsequently as Durbar charges, *ib.*;—Acknowledgment of intention to conceal the receipt of the presents from the Directors, 166;—Fear of discovery, 167;—Evasion of explanation required by the Directors, 168;—False bonds taken from the Company, *ib.*;—Connivance of Mr. Larkins, *ib.*;—Declaration that they were for the Company's service, 169.

**CONCLUSION OF THE SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE, MANAGER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN OPENING THE SIXTH CHARGE, RELATING TO PRESENTS; 7TH MAY, 1789.**

Concealments in accounts, 171;—Falsifications, 172;—Promise of explanation of the bribe from the Nawab of Oude, *ib.*;—Major Fairfax sent to England to explain, 173;—Is unable to give information, *ib.*;—A second agent, Major Scott, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' letter from Cheltenham, 174;—His reference to Mr. Larkins, *ib.*;—Defectiveness of his account, 176;—Dinapore bribe, *ib.*;—Money received from Patna, 177;—Money received from Nuddea, *ib.*;—Concealment of names of parties, 178;—Discovery by Parliamentary investigations, 179;—Mr. Larkins' letter, *ib.*;—His avowal of considering it a point of honour to screen Mr. Hastings, 180;—Various agents employed by Mr. Hastings in receiving bribes, *ib.*;—Concealment from Mr. Larkins of the sources from which the money was received, 182;—Subsequent acknowledgment to him of the receipt of £100,000 from the Nawab of Oude, 183;—Mr. Hastings reminded by Mr. Larkins of his promise to account to the Directors, *ib.*;—His efforts to recover the circumstances, 184;—Memoranda kept by Cantoo Baboo, Mr. Crofts, and a munshi,

*ib.*;—No other accounts preserved of the moneys received, 185;—Account obtained by inquiries of the House of Commons, 186;—Recapitulation, 187;—Deficiency of £40,000 in a sum due from Gunga Govind Sing, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' conduct towards Gunga Govind Sing, 189;—Recommends him reward, *ib.*;—Money due from Patna, 190;—Loss occasioned by dealings of Mr. Hastings with usurious agents, *ib.*;—Money due from Nuddea, 192;—Backwardness of the Directors in investigating these transactions, *ib.*;—Present received from Nundulol, *ib.*;—Mr. Larkins' accounts, *ib.*;—False statements of time of payment, 193;—The sum suffered to lie in Gunga Govind Sing's hands, 194;—Bonds taken for the money by Mr. Hastings as if his own, 195;—The money represented by Mr. Larkins as two thirds the Company's and one third Mr. Hastings', *ib.*;—The whole sum confounded under bonds, *ib.*;—His fraudulent deposits, 196;—Cheyt Sing's bribe of £23,000 conveyed by different persons to Mr. Larkins, 198;—The transaction concealed from Mr. Hastings' colleagues, *ib.*;—The Persian account, 199;—Presents from the Nawab of Oude and Hussim Reza Khan to Mr. Hastings, 200;—Present to Mrs. Hastings, *ib.*;—Probability of other bribes, 201;—Mr. Hastings' motives for keeping the transaction from a court of justice, *ib.*;—The money received from Dinagepore taken from the Raja, *ib.*;—Adoption of a son by the Rajah Bija Naut, 203;—Recognition of the adoption by Mr. Hastings on report from Gunga Govind Sing, *ib.*;—Sum of money paid to Mr. Hastings through Gunga Govind Sing, *ib.*;—Deby Sing appointed guardian of the young Raja, *ib.*;—Cruelties practised in the province, *ib.*;—Certificate of the young Raja in favour of Mr. Hastings, 204;—Recapitulation, 205;—Character of certificates procured from the native princes by Mr. Hastings, 206;—Recapitulation respecting Mr. Hastings' system of bribery, 207;—Confederation of persons in India, 208;—Danger of corruption of the English character from examples of successful fraud, *ib.*;—Danger of influence of Indian wealth on the liberties of the country, 209.

SPEECH OF JOHN ASTRUTHER, ESQ., MANAGER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN OPENING THE SECOND PART OF THE SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO PRESENTS; 16TH FEBRUARY, 1790.

Corruption in government, 210;—In administration of the revenue, 211;—Disobedience to orders of Directors, *ib.*;—Overthrow of establishments, *ib.*;—Provinces committed to those who offered presents, 211;—Checks withdrawn, *ib.*;—Infamous character of those promoted, 212;—Injury to the revenue, *ib.*;—Changes in system of government prior to 1773, 213;—Mr. Hastings' plan for administering the revenue, *ib.*;—Provincial Councils, *ib.*;—Object of bringing the collection to Calcutta, *ib.*;—Pretended control of the Provincial Councils, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' approval of the system of Provincial Councils, 214;—Order of Directors against innovations, 215;—New plan introduced with-



out their permission, *ib.*;—Particulars of the plan, 216;—Rent from Zamindars, *ib.*;—Breach of orders of Directors as to letting the lands, 217;—The Zamindaries let to farm, 219;—Money paid to Mr. Hastings by the farmers, *ib.*;—Innovations by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Dininition of revenue, *ib.*;—Corrupt motives in the changes, *ib.*;—Power of the Revenue Councils vested in the Supreme Board at Calcutta, 220;—Suppression of the control of the Board, 221;—Corrupt motive in abolishing Provincial Councils, *ib.*;—Character of the Board established by him, *ib.*;—Mr. Crofts connected with Mr. Hastings, 222;—The Council tools in the hand of their diwan, *ib.*;—Gunga Govind Sing, the diwan, the receiver of Mr. Hastings' bribes, 223;—His character, 224;—His dismissal from a previous office, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings aware of his character, 225;—Inefficiency of the Committee of Revenue, *ib.*;—Oppressions of Deby Sing, 226;—Practice of uniting offices of farmer and diwan, *ib.*;—Purpose to establish a government of concealment, 227;—Presents received from farmers of the provinces, 228;—Infamous character of Kelloram, *ib.*;—Province of Behar let to him, and present received, 229;—Concealment of present, *ib.*;—Gunga Govind Sing the accomplice of Kelloram, *ib.*;—Oppressions by Kelloram, 230;—Loss to the revenue, 231;—Case of Dinagepore, *ib.*;—Money taken from the province, *ib.*;—Oppressions of Deby Sing, 232;—Mr. Hastings responsible, *ib.*;—Aware of Deby Sing's character, 233;—Increased revenue levied on the province, 234;—Deposition of the Raja, *ib.*;—The Raja's arrears occasioned by payments to Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Appointment of Deby Sing as diwan, 235;—And guardian to the Raja, 236;—His severities, *ib.*;—The province let to the Raja at reduced rent, 237;—Mr. Paterson commissioned to inquire, 238;—Second commission, *ib.*;—Responsibility of Mr. Hastings, 239;—Deby Sing's cruelties the result of extreme levies of money, *ib.*;—Lord Cornwallis' opinion, 240;—Mr. Hastings' responsibility, 241;—Case of province of Rajeshaye, 241;—Present from Nundulul, *ib.*;—His dismissal for corrupt practices, 242;—Reinstated by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Oppression of the province, *ib.*;—Arrears in his account, 243;—Protected by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—His removal, 244;—Loan taken from Nobkissen, 245;—His arrears, *ib.*;—Money taken from the province of Nuddea, 247;—Ejection of the Raja, *ib.*;—Corruption in the Government, 248;—Dispute respecting the Rajaship of Dinagepore, *ib.*;—Disputed succession to Rajeshaye, 249;—Sale of justice, *ib.*;—Money received for Mr. Hastings' own use, 250;—Nature of the evidence, *ib.*;—Captain Donellan, 251;—Discovery of bribes from Mr. Hastings' letters, 252;—False accounts of moneys received by him, 254;—Bonds for moneys lent to the Company, 255;—Mis-statements respecting them, 256;—Attempt to conceal receipt of money, 257;—Money received from the Nawab of Oude, 259;—Attempt to secure it by false representations to the Directors, 260;—Mr. Hastings' account of his transaction with Nobkissen, 262;—Mr. Larkins' letter, *ib.*;—Surts in Gunga Govind Sing's hands not accounted for, 265;—Mr. Larkins' explanations, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' panegyric of Gunga Govind Sing, 266;—Recapitulation, 267;—Impoverishment of the country, *ib.*;—Pretended success of Mr. Hastings' government, 268.

SPEECH OF THE RT. HON. CHARLES JAMES FOX, MANAGER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN SUMMING UP THE EVIDENCE ON THE SIXTH, SEVENTH AND FOURTEENTH, ARTICLES OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO PRESENTS; 7TH JUNE, 1780.

Unattractiveness of the subject, 272;—Apology for method of presenting the evidence, 273;—Early corruption among the Company's servants, 274;—Covenants against presents, *ib.*;—Oath taken by the Governors of Bengal, *ib.*;—Question of Mr. Hastings having taken the oath, 275;—Covenant entered into by him, 276;—Order of Directors against presents, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings restrained from taking presents, previous to the Act of Parliament, 277;—Duty to prevent corruption in the service, *ib.*; Charge of bribe received through Nundcomar from Munny Begum, 278;—Nundcomar's accusation of Mr. Hastings through Mr. Francis, 280;—His mode of meeting the charge, *ib.*;—Mr. Goring deputed by the Council to inquire, 281;—His letter criminating Mr. Hastings, 282;—Implied admission of receipt of money by Mr. Hastings, 283;—Further report by Mr. Goring, *ib.*;—Statement of money received by Mr. Hastings from Munny Begum, 284;—Not denied by him, 285;—Questions proposed by Mr. Hastings to be put to the Begum, *ib.*;—Observations by Col. Monson, 286;—Answer of Munny Begum to the questions, 287;—Mode of making the inquiry by Mr. Goring, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' conduct in reference to the inquiry, 288;—The receipt of the money not denied, *ib.*;—Minute of the majority of the Council, 289;—Mr. Hastings' minute in answer, 291;—Refusal to reply to particular charges, 292;—His letter to the Directors, 293;—Impropriety of the appointment of Munny Begum, 294;—Order of Directors relative to the appointment to Mohammed Reza Khan's office, 294;—Yetteram-ud-Dowla rejected by Mr. Hastings, 295;—His appointment of Munny Begum, 296;—Disobedience to orders of Directors, *ib.*;—Crime inferred, 297;—Aggravations of the offence, 298;—Order of the Directors to reduce the Nawab's allowance, 299;—Merit claimed by Mr. Hastings for reductions in the Nawab's household, *ib.*;—His assertions disproved, 301;—Mr. Croft's accounts, 302;—Error in them, 303;—Account by Mr. Johnson, 304;—Contradictions in the accounts, 305;—Mr. Hastings did not reduce the Nawab's allowance, 306;—Money accepted in consideration of forbearance, *ib.*;—Order of Directors requiring accounts of the Nawab's expenditure, 307;—Admission of Mr. Hastings that the accounts had not been kept, *ib.*;—Their value in proving sums received by Mr. Hastings, 309;—Reduction made in the Nawab's household, 310;—The Nawab's allowance not simultaneously reduced, 311;—The difference expended in presents to Mr. Hastings, 312;—Aggravating circumstances, 313;—Subsequent partiality to Munny Begum, *ib.*;—Munny Begum's unsuitableness for the appointment of Guardian to the Nawab, 315;—Rejection of Yetteram-ud-Dowla, 315;—Claim of Baboo Begum, 316;—Preference of Munny Begum, *ib.*;—Concealment of claims of Baboo Begum from the Directors, 317;—Recapitulation, *ib.*;—Evidence relating to presents subsequent to the Act prohibiting them, 318;—The Act so construed by Mr. Hastings, 319;—The *naer*, or

present from an inferior, *ib.*;—Encomium on Gen. Clavering, Col. Monson, and Mr. Francis, *ib.*;—Prohibition of presents by the Directors, 320;—And by the Act of Parliament, *ib.*;—Imputation of presents received by Mr. Hastings, 322;—Taken covertly, 323;—Letter to the Directors acknowledging present from the Wazir, 324;—Transmitted through Major Scott, 325;—Imposes an account, 326;—Distress of the Nawab, 327;—Resumption of the jagirs to meet his difficulties, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' offer of a loan to the Council, 328;—Avowal of acceptance of the present, 329;—Reference by him to another similar transaction;—Money paid by him to the Government of Berar, 330;—Ply raised on his own credit, *ib.*;—Comparison of the two statements, *ib.*;—Contradictions in his accounts, 331;—Mr. Larkins' evidence, 332;—Bonds taken of the Company by Mr. Huggs, 333;—Delay in despatching letter relating to them, *ib.*;—Fear of an investigation, 334;—Letter of the 16th Dec. 32, *ib.*;—Indorsement of the bonds, 335;—Mis-statement of the indorsement, 336;—Reasons for taking the bonds, *ib.*;—Fraud in taking bonds for money belonging to the Company, 339;—Assertion that it was in his power to withhold the money from the Company, 341;—Pretended fear of exciting jealousy of his colleagues, 343;—Part of the money entered a deposit, 344;—Dissatisfaction of the Directors, 346;—Their demand of fuller explanation, 347;—Letter of Mr. Hastings to Cheltenham, 348;—Present from Cheyt Sing, 350;—Letter of Mr. Larkins, 351;—Expectation of Cheyt Sing of return for the bribe, 352;—Plea of the Company's distress in justification of taking presents, 354;—Money received from Nundulul, *ib.*;—Larkins' explanation, *ib.*;—Concealment of the present from Mr. Anderson, 355;—Kelleram's present, *ib.*;—A private letter to Mr. Hastings, 356;—Province of Behar let to Kelleram, *ib.*;—His unfitness for the appointment, 358;—Receipt of the money by Gunga Govind Sing, *ib.*;—Part of the amount recd by him, 359;—His share of the bribe, 360;—Inconsistency of Mr. Hastings' accounts, 361;—Secrecy and mystery, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' system of fraud, 362;—Concealment by falsehood, *ib.*;—Comparison with case of Capt. Donellan, 365;—Deferred application of the presents to the service of the Company;—Plea of distress from salary not being paid, 369.

CONTINUATION OF THE SPEECH OF THE RT HON. CHARLES JAMES FOX, MANAGER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN SUMMING UP THE EVIDENCE ON THE SIXTH, SEVENTH AND FOURTEENTH, ARTICLES OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO PRESENTS; 9TH JUNE, 1790.

Fourteenth Article of the Charge;—Present from the Wazir, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' instruction to Major Palmer, 373;—Rejection of the present, in the first instance, 373;—Subsequent acceptance of it, 375;—Concealment of presents from his colleagues, 376;—Communication of the Wazir's offer, *ib.*;—Inconsistency, 377;—Mr. Hastings' charge against Johnson of counteracting intention of the Wazir to deliver the present to the

Company, 378 ;—Reference of the case to the Directors, 382 ;—Proof of a sum of ten lacs demanded of the Wazir, *ib.* ;—Proof of the donation of the sum by the Wazir, 386 ;—Mr. Hastings' acquittal of Johnson, 387 ;—Subsequent employment of him, *ib.* ;—Aggravating circumstances, 389 ;—Suspicious circumstances, 390 ;—Want of honesty in money transactions, 391 ;—The Seventh Article, 392 ;—Administration of the revenue, *ib.* ;—Present from renters of lands, *ib.* ;—Appointment of amins to inquire to value of land, *ib.* ;—Power of corporal punishment given them, 394 ;—Gunga Govind Sing, *ib.* ;—An agent for receipt of bribes, 395 ;—The appointment of amins unnecessary, *ib.* ;—Capt motive in their appointment, 396 ;—Disapproval of Directors, 397 ;—Criminality in the suppression of the Provincial Councils, 399 ;—Usurpation of power in instituting Committee of Revenue, 400 ;—Previous opinion in favour of Provincial Councils, *ib.* ;—His reasons for condemning them, 403 ;—Opposition from the Councils, 405 ;—Detection of bribes, *ib.* ;—Constitution of the Committee of Revenue, 406 ;—Abolition of superintendency of the khalsa records, 407 ;—Gunga Govind Sing diwan the Committee, 408 ;—Power given to Mr. Croftes, 409 ;—The Committee a tool in the hands of the diwan, 410 ;—Minute of J. Shore, *ib.* ;—Office of naib-kanungo, 412 ;—Removal of checks on the diwan, *ib.* ;—Directors' disapproval of Gunga Gov. Sing, 413 ;—Power of the diwan, 414 ;—His irresponsibility, *ib.* ;—Enormities committed by Deby Sing, 415 ;—The result of Mr. Hastings' system, 416 ;—Inference of systematic bribery, 417 ;—Removal of checks, 417 ;—Means of discovery of bribes detected, 418 ;—Recapitulation of circumstances proved, 419 ;—Mr. Hastings' defences, 421 ;—Increase of receipts through Committee of Revenue, *ib.* ;—Duty of controlling collection of the revenue, 423 ;—Conclusion, *ib.*

SPEECH OF THE HON. ANDREW ST. JOHN, MANAGER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN OPENING THE FOURTH ARTICLE OF CHARGE, RELATIVE TO CORRUPT CONTRACTS ; 23RD MAY, 1791.

Charge of prodigal and corrupt system of government, 425 ;—Question of discretion in expenditure, 426 ;—Code of instructions from the Directors, 427 ;—Article relating to contracts, *ib.* ;—Contract granted to Mr. S. Sullivan, *ib.* ;—Management of opium by the Company, 428 ;—Contract granted to Mir Munnir in 1773, *ib.* ;—The contract advertised in 1775, *ib.* ;—Corrupt system commenced by Mr. Hastings after Colonel Monson's death, *ib.* ;—Grant of the contract 1777 to Mr. Mackensie, *ib.* ;—Disapprobation of the Company, *ib.* ;—Contract again given to Mr. Mackensie, *ib.* ;—Contract granted to Mr. S. Sullivan, 429 ;—Various appointments enjoyed by Mr. Sullivan, *ib.* ;—The contract granted for four years, *ib.* ;—Experience of Mr. Sullivan, 430 ;—Mitigation of penalty for performance of contract, *ib.* ;—Abolition of office of inspector, 431 ;—Sale of the contract by Mr. Sullivan, 431 ;—Purchased by Young, *ib.* ;—Loss in the contract, *ib.*

Smuggling transaction with China, 432;—Disobedience orders of Directors, *ib.*;—Monopoly of the opium trade recommended by Col. Watson, 433;—Loans raised by the Company, *ib.*;—Loss accruing from the trade, *ib.*;—Other instances of corruption, 434;—Precautions of Directors respecting contracts for bullocks, *ib.*;—Order for advertising the contract, 435;—Assignment of contract to Mr. Johnson without advertisement, *ib.*;—Emendations in the contract proposed by Sir Eyre Coote, *ib.*;—Contract assigned to Mr. Crofts, 436;—Repurchase of the contract, *ib.*;—Contract made for larger number of bullocks than the price required, *ib.*;—Increased rate of contract, 437;—Neglect of order to advertise the contract, *ib.*;—Renewal of contract on failure of notice, 438;—Price paid for repurchase of the contract, *ib.*;—Contract converted into agency against orders of Directors, *ib.*;—Corrupt means employed to secure the support of Sir Eyre Coote, 439;—Salary to him as Member of Council and Commander-in-Chief, *ib.*;—Allowances, *ib.*;—The allowances charged to Nawab of Oude, 440;—Correspondence with the Nawab, *ib.*;—Order of Directors to stop the allowances, 441;—Agency granted to Mr. Anriol, *ib.*;—Distress at Madras, and famine in the Carnatic, *ib.*;—Accounts passed without vouchers, *ib.*;—Similar agency held by Mr. Hastings, 442;—Censured by the Directors, *ib.*;—Application of Mr. Anriol for agency to supply provisions, accounting upon honour, *ib.*;—Granted on Mr. Hastings' recommendation, *ib.*;—Vouchers not produced in his account, 443;—Agency granted to Mr. Belli to supply stores to Fort William, *ib.*;—Extravagant commission, *ib.*;—Disapproval of Directors, 444;—Contract granted for five years, *ib.*;—Losses from the several contracts, *ib.*;—Reflections on the injury to the Company, 445;—Corrupt motives, *ib.*

**SPEECH OF SIR JAMES ERSKINE ST. CLAIR, MANAGER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, IN SUMMING-UP THE EVIDENCE ON THE FOURTH ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO CORRUPT CONTRACTS; 30TH MAY, 1791.**

Nature of the Charge, 447;—Plea of necessity, *ib.*;—The necessity created by Mr. Hastings' extravagance, *ib.*;—His principle of ingratiating himself with persons in power at home, 448;—Reasons for the rejection by the Commons of many of the Articles of Charge, *ib.*;—Opium contract granted to Mr. Sullivan, *ib.*;—Order of the Directors, 449;—Previous disobedience to the order in the contract given to Mr. Mackenzie, *ib.*;—Circumstances of the grant of the contract to Mr. Sullivan, *ib.*;—Abolition of office of inspector, 450;—Commissions to different persons as compensation, *ib.*;—Extravagant terms of the contract, 451;—Total loss to the Company, *ib.*;—Successive sales of the contract, *ib.*;—Period of the loss incurred concurrent with the exactions from Cheyt Sing, *ib.*;—Motive for the grant to Mr. Sullivan, 452;—Relationship to the chairman of the Company, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' motives for desiring the friendship of Mr. Sullivan, 453;—Contract for exporting opium to China, 454;

—Loss on the transaction, *ib.*;—The bullock contract granted for three years in 1777, 456;—Second contract in 1779, *ib.*;—The first contract dissolved by Mr. Hastings, and offered again on new terms, *ib.*;—Sir Eyre Coote's estimate of number of bullocks required, *ib.*;—Loss on the new contract, 457;—Date of the contract, 458;—Date of subsidy from Cheyt Sing, *ib.*;—The subsidy exceeded by the loss on the contract, 459;—Reduction of the contract ordered by the Directors, 460;—Term for notice of termination of contract suffered to elapse, *ib.*;—Purchase of the relinquishment of the contract, *ib.*;—Agency established, *ib.*;—Total loss on the bullock contract, *ib.*;—Allowance of Commander-in-Chief fixed in the case of Gen. Clavering, 461;—Increased allowances in favour of Sir Eyre Coote, *ib.*;—His subsequent support of the bullock contract, 462;—The allowance charged on the Wazir, *ib.*;—The charge beyond the amount allowed in the treaty, *ib.*;—Continuance of the charge after the withdrawal of Sir Eyre Coote from Oude, 463;—Authority for making the demand given by Mr. Hastings to Mr. Croftes, *ib.*;—Mr. Croftes in the confidence of Mr. Hastings and Sir Eyre Coote, 464;—Secret advantages to Mr. Hastings from the allowances, *ib.*;—Amount received by Sir Eyre Coote, 465;—Corruption of the service, *ib.*;—Assertion of Mr. Hastings that he ordered the discontinuance of the allowances, 466;—Corrupt agencies, 467;—Mr. Auriol's offer to supply provisions on the contract rejected, *ib.*;—His appointment as agent, *ib.*;—Complaint of the price of the rice supplied to Bombay, *ib.*;—Extravagant commission allowed to Mr. Auriol, *ib.*;—Loss to the Company, 468;—The agent to account upon honour, 469;—Reduction of the agency ordered by the Directors, 470;—Offer of Mr. Auriol to execute the agency gratuitously, *ib.*;—Charge of interest on advances, *ib.*;—Condition of accounting upon honour annexed to the offer of acting gratuitously, 471;—Formation of the depôt of provisions in Fort William, 472;—Judged unnecessary by Gen. Clavering, *ib.*;—Appointment of agent for the depôt, *ib.*;—Terms of allowance referred to three merchants, *ib.*;—Their recommendation of 20 per cent. commission, 473;—Thirty per cent. recommended by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Minutes in Council in opposition to Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Proposal of Mr. Hastings that his private secretary, Mr. Belli, should keep the accounts, 474;—Production of Mr. Belli's accounts, *ib.*;—Charge of £10,000 for sundries, *ib.*;—Net profit to the accountant, *ib.*;—Proposal of Mr. Hastings to convert the agency into a contract, 475;—Expectation of loss of his office, *ib.*;—His purpose to embarrass his successor with difficulties, 476;—And to reward his adherents, *ib.*;—These motives charged against him at the Board, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' answer, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' suspicion that his adherents would be persecuted by his opponents, 477;—Recapitulation, 478;—False pretence of public necessity to justify tyranny, 479;—Omission of some of the Articles of the Charge, *ib.*;—Rumoured attempt to influence the judgment of the Court by bribery, 480.

ADDRESS OF WARREN HASTINGS, ESQ., IN HIS DEFENCE UPON  
THE SEVERAL ARTICLES OF THE CHARGE; 2ND JUNE,  
1791.

Apology for delivery of the address, 482 ;—Delivered from writing, *ib.* ;—Impossibility of presenting full defence to all the Articles of Charge, 483 ;—Influence of length of proceedings, 484 ;—Changes in the members of the Court, *ib.* ;—Uncertainty of his own life, *ib.* ;—Reflection on the violence of the speeches of the Managers, 486 ;—Failure of the evidence, 487 ;—Cause of the delay unjustly imputed to himself, *ib.* ;—Comprehensiveness of the Charges, *ib.* ;—Charge of the ruin of the country, 488 ;—Violation of treaties, *ib.* ;—Testimonials from native princes, *ib.* ;—Extortion and exaction, *ib.* ;—Attempt to discredit the testimonies in his favour, *ib.* ;—Squandering the revenues, 489 ;—Disobedience to orders of the Directors, *ib.* ;—Thanks to the Directors, *ib.* ;—Approval of Proprietors, *ib.* ;—Answer to criminal points in the charges, *ib.* ;—Transactions at Benares, 490 ;—Cheyt Sing not an independent prince, *ib.* ;—The Company's right to increase Cheyt Sing's tribute, 491 ;—Amount of demands made upon him, 492 ;—Enforcement of the demands, *ib.* ;—Arrest of Cheyt Sing, *ib.* ;—Fine of fifty lacs, *ib.* ;—Necessities of the Company, 493 ;—Appointment of successor, and increase of tribute, *ib.* ;—Approbation of the Directors, *ib.* ;—And of the Ministers of State, 494 ;—Disavowal of arbitrary power, *ib.* ;—Spoliation of the Begum of Oude, *ib.* ;—Not responsible for cruelties, 495 ;—Disaffection of the Begum, *ib.* ;—The Company's guarantee, *ib.* ;—Denial of the Begum's title to the treasures, 496 ;—Recommendation of the general resumption of the jagirs, 497 ;—Contradiction in the Articles of the Charge, 498 ;—Equivalent in money given for the jagirs, *ib.* ;—The Company's want of money, *ib.* ;—Defence of motives, 499 ;—Charge of presents, *ib.* ;—Concealed presents, *ib.* ;—Usual entertainments given to a visitor, *ib.* ;—Failure of attempt to prosecute for the transaction, 500 ;—Reappointments as Governor General, *ib.* ;—Denial of the charge of receiving presents, *ib.* ;—Argument of variation in accounts, *ib.* ;—Admission of mistakes, 501 ;—Indorsement of the bonds, *ib.* ;—No corrupt service done for the persons making the presents, 502 ;—Disavowal of consideration of private interests, *ib.* ;—Violation of Act of Parliament, 503 ;—Customary presents not prohibited, *ib.* ;—Contracts and allowances, 504 ;—Opium contract given to Mr. Sullivan, *ib.* ;—Circumstances of the grant, *ib.* ;—Army cattle contract, 505 ;—Reason for not putting it to auction, *ib.* ;—Extra allowances to Sir Eyre Coote, 506 ;—Higher allowance to Gen. Stibbert while in cantonments, 507 ;—Importance of Sir Eyre Coote's services, *ib.* ;—Mr. Auriol's agency, *ib.* ;—Alarming situation of the Carnatic, *ib.* ;—Application of the Madras Residency, 508 ;—Failure of contracts, *ib.* ;—Integrity of Mr. Auriol, 509 ;—Accounting upon honour, *ib.* ;—Agency of Mr. Belli, *ib.* ;—Commission of 30 *per cent.* justified, 510 ;—Asserted cruelties of Deby Sing, *ib.* ;—Approbation of Ministers and House of Commons, 511 ;—Charge of ruining the natives of Bengal, 512 ;—Intention of paying the presents received to the Company's service, 513 ;—The Begum's

disaffection, *ib.*;—The Company's difficulties, *ib.*;—Difficulty of raising a loan for a remittance to Sir Eyre Coote, 514;—Distress of Colonel Muir, *ib.*;—138 lacs procured from Oude, 515;—Assistance from the Begum to Cheyt Sing, *ib.*;—Testimony in his favour by the inhabitants of India, 517;—Implied approval of his measures by the Ministers and Directors, 518;—His successive appointments, 519;—Success of his administration, *ib.*;—Revenue establishment and courts of law, 520;—Government of Benares, *ib.*;—Defence of Oude, *ib.*;—Revenues from opium and salt, *ib.*;—Flourishing condition of the British provinces in India, 521;—Successful negotiations with native princes, *ib.*;—Gratitude of natives, *ib.*;—Address from English residents in Calcutta, 522;—Actions incompatible with the offences charged, *ib.*

SPEECH OF EDWARD LAW, ESQ., COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT,  
IN OPENING THE DEFENCE UPON THE SEVERAL ARTICLES  
OF THE CHARGE; 14TH FEBRUARY, 1792.

Prejudice against the Defendant, 525;—Disadvantages of the Counsel, *ib.*;—Character of the tribunal, 526;—Conduct of Counsel with respect to objections to evidence, 527;—Inequality between Managers and Counsel, 528;—Respect for prosecutors, 528;—Insulting language in State prosecutions, *ib.*;—Historical sketch of Hindustan, 532;—Brahmanical era, *ib.*;—Mohammedan era, 533;—Tamerlane, 534;—His cruelty, *ib.*;—Mildness of British rule, 535;—Reign of Akhbar Khan, 536;—Practice of assassination, *ib.*;—Aurangzebe, *ib.*;—Exercise of arbitrary power, 537;—Terry's travels, *ib.*;—Mandelslo, 538;—Tavernier, *ib.*;—Bernier, 539;—Catrou, *ib.*;—Ogilby, *ib.*;—Montesquieu, 540;—Jaffier Khan's government of Bengal, *ib.*;—His character, 541;—English settlement, 542;—Grant of free trade, 543;—Succession of emperors, *ib.*;—Invasion of Nadir Shah, 544;—Mahratta empire, 545;—Defeat of Mahrattas by the Mohammedans, 546;—Destruction of Suja-ud-Dowla, *ib.*;—Attack on the English settlement by Suraj-ud-Dowla, 547;—His cruelties, *ib.*;—Successes of English under Clive, *ib.*;—Vindication of English conquests, 548;—Native government preserved, *ib.*;—Treaty with Mir Jaffier, 549;—His treachery, *ib.*;—Insinuations of Mr. Burke respecting sudden death of Miran, 550;—Prejudices concerning English government in India, 552;—Story of the Three Seals, 553;—Project for seizing the Shah Zada, *ib.*;—Vindication of Mr. Hastings, 554;—Acquittal of Col. Caillaud, 555;—Misgovernment by Mir Jaffier, *ib.*;—Conveyance of the province to Cossim Ali Khan, *ib.*;—Alienation of Cossim Ali, 556;—Disputes with the English, 557;—Endeavours of Mr. Hastings to arrange them, 558;—Treaty of Monghyr, *ib.*;—Abolition of duties by Cossim Ali, 559;—Murder of Mr. Ellis, *ib.*;—Abandonment of Cossim Ali's cause by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Overthrow of Cossim Ali, 561;—Merit of Mr. Hastings in not receiving presents from Mir Jaffier, *ib.*;—His return to England, 562;—Massacre of English by Cossim Ali, 563;—Clemency of English towards Suja-ud-Dowla, *ib.*;—Treaty of Allahabad, 564;—Bulwant Sing included, *ib.*;—Confirmed as renter of Benares, 565;—Contribution paid by him to Suja-ud-



Dowla, *ib.*;—Treaty available for his heirs, *ib.*;—Suja-ud-Dowla required to reduce his army, 566;—Management of revenues of Bengal committed to Mohammed Reza Khan, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' government, 567;—Restoration of revenue, *ib.*;—Prosecution of Mohammed Reza Khan, by order of Directors, 568;—Their instructions to employ Nundcomar, 570;—His character, *ib.*;—Acquittal of Mohammed Reza Khan, 572;—Mr. Hastings' suspicions of Nundcomar, *ib.*;—Comparative treatment of Mohammed Reza Khan and Cheyt Sing, 574;—The Company act as their own diwan, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' labours to arrange the collections, *ib.*;—His first intention to move them to Calcutta, 575;—Adoption of Provincial Councils, and subsequent suppression of them, *ib.*;—Creation of revenue from salt and opium, 577.

CONTINUATION OF THE SPEECH OF EDWARD LAW, ESQ.,  
COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT, IN OPENING THE DEFENCE  
UPON THE SEVERAL ARTICLES OF THE CHARGE; 17TH  
FEBRUARY, 1792.

Comparison of early government of India with that of the English, 578;—Topics introduced by the Managers not in the Articles, *ib.*;—Statements respecting Deby Sing, 579;—Effect of them on the public mind, 580;—History of Mr. Hastings' government, 581;—Financial measures, *ib.*;—League of the Emperor with the Mahrattas, 582;—Confiscation of lands given to him by treaty of Allahabad, 582;—The lands given to Suja-ud-Dowla, 583;—Assistance to Suja-ud-Dowla towards protection of the Rohillas from the Mahrattas, *ib.*;—Payments received from him, 584;—Additions to revenue by retrenchments, 585;—Subsidy from Oude, *ib.*;—Obloquy incurred by reduction of Nawab of Bengal's allowance, 586;—Charge of taking one and a half lacs rupees from the Nawab of Bengal, 587;—An usual gift on occasion of a visit, 588;—Liberal treatment of the young Nawab, 589;—Success of Mr. Hastings' government prior to establishment of the Council General, 590;—Prejudices of the members of the Council, *ib.*;—Motives of Mr. Hastings in retaining office, 591;—Attacks against Mr. Hastings by the Council, *ib.*;—The Rohilla war, 592;—Demand by the Council from Mr. Middleton of his correspondence, 593;—Resistance by Mr. Hastings, 594;—Substitution by the Council of Bristow in place of Middleton, 595;—Letter of Mr. Hastings to Directors, *ib.*;—Continued opposition from majority of the Council, 596;—Death of Suja-ud-Dowla, and question of succession, 597;—Benefits of the treaty of Allahabad not allowed to his successor by the Council, 598;—Their demand of Benares from Asoff-ud-Dowla, 599;—Charge imposed on him of his father's debts, *ib.*;—Situation of Asoff-ud-Dowla, 600;—Withdrawal of British troops, *ib.*;—Cession of Benares to the Company, 601;—Inducement of the Wazir to resign his claim to his father's treasures, *ib.*;—Guarantee of the treaty by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Claim of the Begum to the late Wazir's treasure, 602;—Want of legal title, *ib.*;—The Wazir's recommendation of his family to Mr. Hastings, 603;—Debt to the Company at Suja-ud-Dowla's death, 605;—His treasure liable to the debt, *ib.*;—Com-

mission for ascertaining value of lands leased in 1772, 606;—Reasons for the inquiry, 607;—Gunga Govind Sing a member of the Commission, 608;—His previous dismissal from office, *ib.*;—Mr. Francis' account, 609;—Justification of his conduct, 610;—Charge of extraordinary powers vested in the Commission, *ib.*;—The Mahratta war, 612;—Treaty for cession of Salsette to the British, *ib.*;—Disapproved by the government of Bengal, 613;—Intrigue of the Peshwa with the French, 614;—Despatch by Mr. Hastings of troops to Bombay, 616;—Calamitous loss of time by Col. Leslie, *ib.*;—French treaty with the Peshwa, 617;—Surrender of British troops to the Mahrattas, *ib.*;—General Goddard, 618;—News of war with France, *ib.*;—Measures of Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Conciliation of Mudaji Bosa, 619;—Plan of defence of Bengal, *ib.*;—Cheyt Sing required to maintain three battalions, 620;—Qualified assent of Mr. Francis, *ib.*;—Implied approval of Directors and the Ministers, *ib.*;—Not noticed by the Committee of House of Commons, 621;—Tenure of Cheyt Sing, 622;—Military service due from a zamindar, *ib.*;—Moderation of the demand, 623;—Exigencies of the war, 624;—Situation of the Company, 625;—Confederacy against the British, 626;—Necessity for secret service fund, 627;—The Dinagepore peshcush, *ib.*;—Sadanund's present, 628;—Employment of it, *ib.*;—Communication to Directors of receipt of presents, 630;—Invasion of the Carnatic, *ib.*;—Measures proposed by Mr. Hastings, 631.

CONCLUSION OF THE SPEECH OF EDWARD LAW, ESQ., COUNSEL FOR MR. HASTINGS, IN OPENING THE DEFENCE UPON THE SEVERAL ARTICLES OF THE CHARGE; 21ST FEBRUARY, 1792.

Irruption of Hyder Ali into the Carnatic, 635;—Firmness of Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Conduct of Mr. Francis, 636;—Danger to the empire from his pusillanimity, 637;—Appointment of Sir Eyre Coote as General, 639;—His suggestion of demand of horse from Cheyt Sing, 640;—Negotiation with the Berar Raja, *ib.*;—Sir Eyre Coote's demand of increased allowance, 642;—Consent of Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Previous order of Directors reducing allowances, 643;—The Directors unaware of state of affairs, *ib.*;—Vindication of Mr. Hastings, 644;—Mr. Hastings' own acknowledgment the only evidence of presents received by him, *ib.*;—Violent language of the Managers, 645;—Testimony of native princes in Mr. Hastings' favour, 646;—Mr. Auriol's agency, 648;—Accounting upon honour, *ib.*;—Apprehended failure of supplies, 649;—Retirement of Mr. Francis at a period of difficulty, *ib.*;—His prediction of the downfall of the empire in India, 650;—Demand of troops from Cheyt Sing, *ib.*;—His refusal, 651;—Demand of 50 lacs, 652;—Mr. Hastings' visit to Oude, 653;—Delegation of power from Council, *ib.*;—Visit to Benares, 655;—Success of government of Ali Ibrahim Khan, 656;—Acceptance by Mr. Hastings of present from the Wazir 657;—High character of Mr. Larkins, *ib.*;—Communications of presents to Directors, 658;—Disaffection of the Begums, 659;—Attack of her servants on Capt. Gordon, 661;—Troops sent to Cheyt Sing, 662;—Revival of the Wazir's claim on the treasure, 663;—Resumption of

the jagirs, 664;—Presents from Kellera and Nundcomar, 665;—Pretended cruelties to the Begum's family, 666;—Evidence of Major Gilpin, 667;—Treaty of Chunar, 668;—Treaty with Madaji Scindia, *ib.*;—War with Hyder Ali, 669;—Increase of the debt, *ib.*;—Famine, 670;—Mr. Belli's agency, 671;—The bullock contract, *ib.*;—Opium contract, 672;—Contract to Mr. Sullivan, 674;—Exportation of opium to China, *ib.*;—Advantages of the Mahratta peace, 676;—Settlement of affairs of Oude, 677;—The Wazir's resentment against Mr. Bristow, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' visit to Oude, 678;—Successful arrangements, *ib.*;—Retirement of Mr. Hastings from office, 679;—Enumeration of successful acts of government, 680;—Gratitude of British inhabitants of India, 681;—Testimonials from the natives, *ib.*;—General integrity of his government, 682;—Conclusion, 683.

SPEECH OF THOMAS PLUMER, ESQ., COUNSEL FOR MR. HASTINGS, IN DEFENCE UPON THE FIRST ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO BENARES; 23RD FEBRUARY, 1792.

Defence on the First Article of Charge, 685;—Prejudice as to the character of Mr. Hastings, 686;—Prepossessions on the side of a charge presented by the House of Commons, 688;—Only a suspicion of criminality asserted by the Impeachment, 689;—Disclaimer of want of respect for the House of Commons, 690;—Impression produced by the character of the Managers, *ib.*;—Asserted unanimity of the House of Commons in presenting the charges, 691;—The honour of the House of Commons not involved in the decision of the cause, 692;—Mr. Hastings' Defence at the bar of the House of Commons, 693;—Not his own composition, 694;—The charge founded on erroneous inferences, 695;—Prefatory portion of the Article, *ib.*;—Accusatory portion, 696;—Charge of ruining Cheyt Sing and the province of Benares, *ib.*;—Journey to Benares to extort money, 697;—The origin of the insurrection charged on Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Events subsequent to the flight of Cheyt Sing, 698;—Settlement of the province, *ib.*;—Statement of the transactions, 699;—Possibility of Cheyt Sing's being responsible for the insurrection, *ib.*;—Charge of deliberate intention to ruin Cheyt Sing, 700;—Concurrence of the Council in all the measures, 701;—Instances of previous dissent, 702;—The measures discussed in presence of Mr. Francis and Mr. Wheler, *ib.*;—Their reprobation of Cheyt Sing's conduct, 703;—Their subsequent recognition of the demand, 704;—Their concurrence in enforcing the demand by troops, *ib.*;—And to impose a fine, *ib.*;—Malice less imputable to Mr. Hastings than to Mr. Francis, *ib.*;—Mr. Francis' doubt of Cheyt Sing's ability to meet the demand, *ib.*;—Contrast with Mr. Hastings' views, 706;—Approval by Mr. Wheler of Mr. Hastings' conduct to Cheyt Sing, *ib.*;—Justification of the measures by general approval of them, 707;—Want of evidence of malice, *ib.*;—Concurrence of persons of different political sentiments, 708;—Instance from the House of Commons, *ib.*;—The question of right referred by Mr. Hastings to the Directors and Ministers, 709;—Mr. Hastings justified in presuming their

approval, 710;—Instance in conduct of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 711;—Plea of press of business in behalf of Ministers, 712;—Mr. Pitt's approval of the act, *ib.*;—Abettors of the measures equally chargeable with malice, 713;—Indulgence to public men, 714;—Mr. Hastings' justified from malice by approval of persons of the highest character, 715;—Charge of breach of treaty in demanding military aid, 716;—Assumption that Cheyt Sing was entitled to exemption, *ib.*;—Subjects bound to contribute to the support of the empire, 717;—The principle in force in India, 718;—Definition of zamindar, *ib.*;—Terms of tenure, 719;—Feudal services in Aliverdy Khan's time, 720;—Agreement with Bulwant Sing and Cheyt Sing, *ib.*;—Cheyt Sing not an independent prince, *ib.*;—His obligation as a subject, *ib.*;—Treaties with Cheyt Sing, 722;—Treaties of the zamindar with the subahdar of Oude, *ib.*;—Bulwant Sing, *ib.*;—His origin, 723;—Purchase of title of Raja, 724;—His tenure of the Company, 726;—Assertion of his attachment to the Company *ib.*;—Proposal to make him independent, 727;—Insincerity of his alliance, *ib.*;—Bulwant Sing opposed to the Company in the battle of Buxar, 728;—His subsequent offer to hold under the Company, *ib.*;—Contract with him, *ib.*;—Second desertion of the Company by Bulwant Sing, 729;—Renewed submission, *ib.*;—Reflections of the Company, 730;—Character of Cheyt Sing's attachment, *ib.*;—Effect of the treaty with Suja-ud-Dowla, 732;—Stipulation for the security of Bulwant Sing, *ib.*;—Position of Bulwant Sing, 733;—Motives for upholding Bulwant Sing, 734;—Interference of the Company to secure Benares to Cheyt Sing at the death of his father, *ib.*;—Cheyt Sing preferred to the legitimate descendant of Bulwant Sing, 725;—Dissatisfaction of the Brahmans, *ib.*;—Cheyt Sing's obligation to the Company, *ib.*;—Intention of Suja-ud-Dowla to dispossess him of the forts, 736;—Intervention of Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Cheyt Sing constituted a zamindar, *ib.*;—Fixity of rent, *ib.*;—Cheyt Sing not exempted from duty as a subject, *ib.*;—Mr. Hastings' declaration, 737;—Transference of Benares to the Company, 738;—Contract of 1775, *ib.*;—Proposal by Mr. Hastings that Cheyt Sing should have independent authority, *ib.*;—Not carried into execution, 739;—Terms of the treaty with Asoff-ud-Dowla, *ib.*;—Sovereignty reserved to the Company, 740;—Misrepresentation in the Article of charge, *ib.*;—Contract of the Company with Cheyt Sing in 1775, 741.

CONTINUATION OF THE SPEECH OF THOMAS PLUMER, ESQ.,  
COUNSEL FOR MR. HASTINGS, IN DEFENCE UPON THE  
FIRST ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO BENARES;  
29TH FEBRUARY, 1792.

Article grounded on question of right, 742;—Cheyt Sing not exempt from military service, 743;—Sovereign rights exercised over Cheyt Sing by the Wazir, *ib.*;—The sovereignty conveyed to the Company, 744;—Object of Mr. Hastings to increase Cheyt Sing's authority, but to maintain sovereign power over him, *ib.*;—The subject considered at several meetings, 746;—The sanads or instruments of investiture, *ib.*;—

Manner of representing the contract in the Article, 747;—Difference between the propositions of the 12th June and the contract, *ib.*;—The quotations in the Article extracted from the propositions, 749;—Actual words of the propositions, 750;—Object in making the rent payable at Patna, *ib.*;—Nature of independence spoken of, *ib.*;—Intention to remove internal control, 751;—Grant of certain prerogatives, *ib.*;—A proof of sovereignty in the grantor, 752;—Case of Earl of Chester or Bishop of Durham, *ib.*;—Proposition respecting the cavalry, 753;—Not intended to preclude the right of requiring assistance, *ib.*;—The duty of assisting with the cavalry inseparable from the obligation to maintain them, *ib.*;—Omission in the Article of words of the proposition, 754;—Discussion of the proposition, 755;—General understanding that the troops were for the service of the Company, 756;—Proposition that no further demands shall be laid upon him, *ib.*;—Terms of the actual agreement, 757;—Instructions to Mr. Fowke, *ib.*;—Notification of sovereignty of the Company, *ib.*;—Proclamation of his authority, 758;—A fixed rent, *ib.*;—Reserve of sovereignty omitted in the Article, *ib.*;—Oath of allegiance, 759;—The sanad, *ib.*;—Exemption from liabilities as a subject not conveyed by the sanads, 760;—Recapitulation, *ib.*;—No grounds for inferring surrender of sovereignty, 761;—Duty of co-operation, *ib.*;—No power in the Government to abdicate the sovereignty, 762;—Answer to objection of incompatibility of undefined demands, with a fixed rent, *ib.*;—Case of liabilities on an estate, 763;—Rebellious conduct of Cheyt Sing, 764;—Disaffection to the Company, 765;—Duty of Mr. Hastings to enforce obedience, *ib.*;—Cheyt Sing's attempt to throw off the Company's control, 766;—Conduct charged against Mr. Hastings antecedent to his visit to Benares, *ib.*;—Imputation of design to ruin Cheyt Sing, 767;—Demand on Cheyt Sing to maintain sepoy, *ib.*;—Assumption of motive in the charge, 768;—Intention not regarded by the law, 769;—Question of breach of treaty, *ib.*;—Malice incapable of proof, *ib.*;—Denial by Mr. Hastings, 770;—Improbability of the imputation, *ib.*;—Justification by character, 771;—Testimonials, 772;—Mr. Hastings' humanity, 773;—Proper occasion for adducing evidence of character, *ib.*;—Grounds of the imputation of malice, 775;—Cheyt Sing's misconduct assumed to excite malice in Mr. Hastings, 776;—Candour of Mr. Hastings in acquitting his opponents of improper motives, 777;—Effect on Cheyt Sing of the division in Council, *ib.*;—Supposition of designed hostility to Cheyt Sing, 778;—Mr. Graham's doubts of Cheyt Sing's fidelity, *ib.*;—Complaints made in 1780 of Cheyt Sing's misconduct, 779;—Mr. Hastings' recommendation to Mr. Markham of forbearance towards Cheyt Sing, *ib.*;—Apprehension of war, 780;—Intelligence received from Mr. Baldwin, 781;—Resolution of the Council on receipt of the intelligence, 783;—Activity of Mr. Hastings in forming plans of defence, 784;—Overtures to the Raja of Berar, *ib.*;—Proposal to raise a force of sepoy, *ib.*;—Unanimity of the Council in recommending hostilities against France, 786;—Liability of Mr. Hastings to blame if he had not called upon Cheyt Sing, 787;—Necessity for ample funds, *ib.*;—Justice of calling upon Cheyt Sing for contribution, 788;—Motion of Mr. Francis for a loan, *ib.*;—Objection of Mr. Hastings

to a loan, 790 ;—Estimated deficiency, 791 ;—Risk of blame in neglecting the precautions, *ib.* ;—Assertion that only Cheyt Sing was assessed, 792 ;—No other person in a similar situation, *ib.* ;—Surplus revenue, *ib.* ;—Personal wealth inherited from his father, 793 ;—Treasure found at Bidjey Gur, *ib.* ;—Benares, the integral part of the empire, 794 ;—Recapitulation, *ib.*

CONTINUATION OF THE SPEECH OF THOMAS PLUMER, ESQ.,  
COUNSEL FOR MR. HASTINGS, IN DEFENCE UPON THE FIRST  
ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO BENARES; 1ST  
MARCH, 1792.

Mr. Hastings' proposed demand on Cheyt Sing not a breach of treaty, 797 ;—Cheyt Sing's supposed exemption, *ib.* ;—Imputation of malice against Mr. Hastings, 798 ;—Documents relating to the demand, 799 ;—Mr. Francis' acquiescence, *ib.* ;—Mr. Barwell's approval, 800 ;—Question of right referred to Directors, *ib.* ;—Concurrence of the Council, 801 ;—Power of the Supreme Council over native subjects, 802 ;—The demand not sufficient to ruin Cheyt Sing, *ib.* ;—Conciliatory letter of Mr. Hastings to Cheyt Sing, 803 ;—Cheyt Sing defers the consideration of the demand, 805 ;—His lukewarmness, *ib.* ;—Mr. Hastings' effort to explain the nature of the demand to Cheyt Sing's vakil, 806 ;—The vakil's acquiescence, *ib.* ;—Endeavour of the vakil to reduce the amount of the sum demanded, 807 ;—Motion of Mr. Hastings for insisting on the demand, *ib.* ;—Mr. Francis' proposal for payment by instalments, 808 ;—Adopted by Cheyt Sing, *ib.* ;—His assent to the demand, 809 ;—Evasion of payment, *ib.* ;—Payment by instalments, 810 ;—Disobedience of Cheyt Sing, 811 ;—Necessity for enforcing obedience, 812 ;—His proposal of deferring payment, *ib.* ;—Payment insisted on by Mr. Hastings, 813 ;—Moderation of his measures, *ib.* ;—Opposed by the majority, 814 ;—Question of right, 815 ;—Of the ability of the Raja to pay, 816 ;—Mr. Francis' acknowledgment of the importance of unanimity in the Board, 817 ;—Mr. Wheler's opinion, *ib.* ;—Agreement of the Board in proposal for requiring immediate payment, 818 ;—Mr. Hastings' letter to Cheyt Sing, *ib.* ;—Letters of Mr. Graham, 819 ;—Hesitation in Cheyt Sing, *ib.* ;—Completion of payment for first year, 820 ;—No unnecessary step taken to obtain payment, *ib.* ;—Letter of Mr. Hastings to Cheyt Sing, 821 ;—No evidence of malignity towards him, *ib.* ;—Further demand of contribution from Cheyt Sing, *ib.* ;—Caused by declaration of war, 822 ;—The demand proposed by Mr. Hastings, *ib.* ;—Concurrence of the Council, 823 ;—Refusal of Cheyt Sing, 824 ;—Right of exemption suggested to him by discussions in the Council, 826 ;—Proposal of Mr. Hastings to use force, *ib.* ;—Opposition of Mr. Francis, 827 ;—Order given for march of troops, 828 ;—Cheyt Sing's promise of compliance, 829 ;—Delay in paying, 830 ;—Correspondence, *ib.* ;—Repetition of orders from the Board, 832 ;—Order for the march of troops, 833 ;—Payment by the Raja, 834 ;—Necessity for compulsion, *ib.* ;—Letter of the majority of the Board to the Directors, 835 ;—Third demand in 1780, 836 ;—Desire of Mr. Hastings to act against Madaji Scindia, 837 ;—His proposal to dem<sup>d</sup> con-

tribution from Cheyt Sing, *ib.*;—Objection of Mr. Francis and Mr. Wheler, *ib.*;—Voluntary payment by Cheyt Sing of fine for delay, 838;—Not in lieu of demand, 839;—Statement by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Promise of Cheyt Sing to comply, 841;—Portion paid, *ib.*;—Acceptance of present from Cheyt Sing for public service, 842;—Mr. Hastings' proposal of a further demand on Cheyt Sing, 843;—Assent of Council, *ib.*;—Letters of the Resident, *ib.*;—Exigencies of the Company, 844;—Cheyt Sing's request for time, 845;—Rejected by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Order of Council for enforcing payment, 846;—And for remission of the amount to Col. Camac, *ib.*;—Promise of compliance, 847;—Payment not made, *ib.*;—Exaction of a fine recommended by Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Approved by the Council, 848;—Payment completed, 850.

CONTINUATION OF THE SPEECH OF THOMAS PLUMER, ESQ.,  
COUNSEL FOR MR. HASTINGS, IN DEFENCE UPON THE  
FIRST ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO BENARES;  
24TH APRIL 1792.

Apology for minuteness in answering the charge, 851;—Subjects to be discussed, 852;—Demand of cavalry in 1780, *ib.*;—Not opposed by Mr. Francis, 853;—Cheyt Sing not required to raise fresh troops, 854;—To be paid for their services, 855;—State of affairs, 856;—Invasion of Hyder Ali, *ib.*;—Defeat of Colonel Baillie, *ib.*;—Letter of Sir E. Hughes, 857;—Measures proposed by Mr. Hastings, 858;—Sir E. Coote's proposal to demand cavalry of Cheyt Sing, 859;—Protection of Benares, 860;—Resolution of the Council to demand cavalry of Cheyt Sing, 861;—Ability of Cheyt Sing to supply them, 862;—His conduct, 863;—Disposition to rebel, 864;—Pretended inability to furnish more than 250 men, 865;—Appointment of Mr. Markham as Resident, 866;—Mr. Hastings' minute, *ib.*;—Evasions of Cheyt Sing, 867;—Charge against Mr. Hastings of design to obtain pretext for violence, 868;—Proof of Mr. Hastings' charge against Cheyt Sing, 869;—Unpunctuality of Cheyt Sing, 870;—Assertion of custom of the country, 872;—Delay in payment the cause of distress to Major Camac, 872;—Delay of Mr. Fowke in remitting the money, 873;—Letter of Major Camac, 874;—Payment by the Raja in bills, *ib.*;—Consequences of his delay, 876;—Malice charged against Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Contumacy of Cheyt Sing, 877;—Subversion of the Company's authority, 878;—Proofs of Cheyt Sing's designs, 880;—Increase of army, *ib.*;—Tampering with the Company's troops, 881;—Offer of asylum to rebels, *ib.*;—Actual rebellion, 883;—Charge of excessive punishment of Cheyt Sing, 884;—Defective police in the province, *ib.*;—The fine not imposed, 886;—Proportion of punishment to offence, 887;—Moderation of Mr. Hastings, 888;—Charge that Mr. Hastings intended to convey the country to the Wazir, 889;—Charge of delegation of power, 890;—Standing order of 1702, 891;—Obsolete or revoked, *ib.*;—Residence of members of the Council in Calcutta, 892;—Precedents 893;—Recent act relating to delegation of power, 894;—Sanctioned by Directors, *ib.*;—Not prohibited, 895;—Letter of Lord Cornwallis, 896.—That power not granted by a full Council,

*ib.*;—The power and plan to be followed not put on record, 897; Generality of the powers, *ib.*;—Objects of Mr. Hastings in going up to Benares, 898;—Proceedings at Benares, *ib.*

CONCLUSION OF THE SPEECH OF THOMAS PLUMER, ESQ., COUNSEL FOR MR. HASTINGS, IN DEFENCE UPON THE FIRST ARTICLE OF THE CHARGE, RELATING TO BENARES; 26TH APRIL, 1792.

Journey to Benares, 899;—Object to retrieve the Company's affairs, 900;—Justification of the fine, *ib.*;—Cheyt Sing induced to resist by the Company's distress, 901;—Charge against Mr. Hastings of going unattended, *ib.*;—Proof of his pacific intentions, 902;—Cheyt Sing's offer of a present, *ib.*;—Conduct of Cheyt Sing at the meeting, 903;—Admission of the Charges against him, 904;—Is accompanied with 2,000 armed men, 905;—They are stationed at Shewalla, 907;—Mr. Hastings' charges against Cheyt Sing, *ib.*;—False answers of Cheyt Sing, 908;—Request for extension of time for subsidy, *ib.*;—Offer of horse, 909;—Neglect of administration of justice, 910;—Alleged submissiveness of Cheyt Sing's letter to Mr. Hastings, *ib.*;—Defiance of the Company's authority, 911;—Necessity of securing his person, 912;—Disgrace involved in the arrest, *ib.*;—Conduct of Cheyt Sing, 914;—Murder of sepoys, *ib.*;—Pretended submission, 915;—Conduct of his troops in the insurrection, *ib.*;—Premeditation, 916;—Pretended interruption of Cheyt Sing in his devotions, 917;—Attempt of the people to force access to Cheyt Sing, 918;—A messenger sent by Mr. Hastings to him, *ib.*;—Delivery of the message, 919;—Massacre of the soldiers, *ib.*;—Escape of Cheyt Sing, 920;—Alleged rejection of his submission, *ib.*;—Preparations to attack Mr. Hastings, 921;—Mr. Hastings' retreat to Chunar, *ib.*;—His danger, 922;—Responsibility of Cheyt Sing for the massacres, *ib.*;—Co-operation of the Begums, 924;—Efforts of Cheyt Sing to raise the country, *ib.*;—His defeat, 927;—Charge against Mr. Hastings of expelling Cheyt Sing from his territories, *ib.*;—Of extortion and oppression, 928;—The attack on Bidjey Ghur, 928;—Defended by the Rani, 929;—Treasures found in the fort, 930;—Orders of Mr. Hastings for their distribution among the troops, *ib.*;—Misconstruction of his letters, 932;—Plunder of the Rani's followers, *ib.*;—Charge of harsh treatment of the Rani, 933;—His humanity towards her, 934;—Arrangements subsequent to Cheyt Sing's flight, 935;—Appointment of Mehipnarain, 936;—Charge of raising the tribute, 937;—Grants to natives for public services, 938;—Pension to Beneram Pandit, *ib.*;—To Bundoo Khan, 939;—Settlement of duties, 940;—Charge of removal of Durbejey Sing, 942;—Charge of ruin of the country, 943;—Establishment of civil and criminal courts, *ib.*;—Prosperous condition of the country, 944;—Moderation of tribute, *ib.*;—Permanence of Mr. Hastings' arrangements, 945;—Contrast of Cheyt Sing with Mr. Hastings, 946.