

the point at once, by removing the heaps of rubbish thrown in the way, and bringing it in the shortest manner I could to the test of facts and reason, is what, in the present remarks, I have undertaken to do. But to return to the *Summary Discussion*.

The author of that tract, having made the most he could of his two authorities, in support of the *French* system concerning the *antient* limits of *Acadia*; starts a new kind of argument to prove, against the *English*, that it could not have been the intention of *France* at the treaty of *Utrecht* to give up the country to the north of the *Peninsula*; namely, because that would be to deprive the *French* of the passage to *Quebek* by the river *St. John*, during seven months of the year, when the river *St. Laurence* would be shut up with ice.

If this was the case, how comes it that argument was never thought of before? How comes it that the *French* commissaries have not made use of it in their memorials? The reason is obvious.

While they thought, by insidious encroachments, to get possession of this river with the rest of *Nova Scotia*, they said nothing about it: But now they find themselves on the point of being expelled, the mystery comes out.

Hence it seems evident, that the main drift of the author of the *Summary* and his directors, by that pamphlet, is to see if our Ministers can be prevailed with to give up to them the possession of *St. John's* river in *Nova Scotia*.