

Dunkirk, either in what had passed by word of mouth, or in writing, with relation to the peace between the two Crowns.

In fact, it was unjust to insist on this article, since the Court of London, having had this principle established, in treating of peace, to adhere to the Memorial of *Uti possidetis* of the 26th March, they could not pretend that the present state of Dunkirk was comprised in the *Uti possidetis* of France.

The liberty of fishing, and the shelter without fortifications, was the compensation for the cession of all Canada, and of the guaranty which France offered to make to England of that considerable part of North America. The restitution of the island of Minorca was certainly equivalent to the cession of Guadalupa and Marigalante; and the evacuation of Hesse and the other countries appertaining to the Elector of Hanover and to the Landgrave, was compensated by the restitution of Senegal and Goree, and of Belle-Isle, which had been conquered since the Memorial of the 26th March, and after the proposition of the epochs proposed in that Memorial.

Besides, France had declared, at the time of taking Belle-Isle, that she did not understand that conquest was to have been an object of compensation, and that she thought the keeping of Belle-Isle would be more expensive than profitable to England.

Mr Stanley, in opposing the cession of Isle Royal to France, absolutely refused the restitution of Senegal and Goree, pretending that Senegal could not be securely maintained without Goree; in the end, he insisted on the demolition of Dunkirk as a condition absolutely necessary. The article relating to Germany was not negotiated on his part; and after several conferences it was agreed, that France should prepare a Memorial of specific propositions, which should be
sent