

the leading principle in the discussion laid down by the French commissaries, That because the peace of Utrecht ceded the country of Nova Scotia or Acadia to Great Britain, therefore no additional lights and evidence are to be brought from acts of government, treaties between two nations, or similar cessions of the same territory, previous to the treaty of Utrecht, to clear up and enforce the true meaning and real intention of that treaty.

A. D.
1753.

Then they proceed to shew, That the design of the crown of Great Britain, in the twelfth article of the treaty of Utrecht, was not to secure an exclusive fishery, but to gain possession of all Acadia or Nova Scotia, as a territory that would give strength and intireness to the British settlement in North America²: and that the commissaries of his most Christian Majesty, by treating the object of the twelfth article concerning the territory of Acadia, and the thirteenth article concerning the fishery as one, they restrain the sense of one part of these articles by confounding it with the other; first misrepresenting the views of Great Britain at the time of the treaty, and afterwards supporting their misconstruction of the words of the treaty by the help of that very misrepresentation.

But for as much, as the French commissaries accuse the English of producing evidences foreign to the question, in proof of their interpretation of the twelfth article of the treaty of Utrecht, concerning the antient limits of Acadia or Nova Scotia, they appeal to, and shew from the treaty of

² See Memorials, vol. I. p. 244, &c.