

surrender, have judged himself more secure of the continent than of the islands, especially as he had in exprefs terms yielded up the *whole* of that country to *Britain* ?

This is on a supposition, that the continent to the north of the *Peninsula* was at that time in the hands of the *French King*, as well as the islands. But supposing it was then in the possession of the *English*, as it was by the late conquest in 1710 (for *French* intrusions, if there were any, did not affect our right \*) there was still the more reason in case *France* ceded no more than a part of that *Peninsula* to *Britain*, why the remainder of *Nova Scotia*, or *Acadia*, should have been formally restored to *France*, which, for want of such authentic restitution, must want a title to the same, which title consequently remains in the *English*.

The argument against a partial cession of *Nova Scotia*, or *Acadia*, in the treaty of *Utrecht*, drawn from *Louis XIV.* not reserving a right to any part thereof, except the islands, is corroborated his by not reserving a right to fortify any other part.

If that King had judged the east coast of *Nova Scotia*, or *Acadia*, belonged to him, is it not likely that he would have required liberty to fortify some of its ports, as well as the adjacent isles ? But whatever reasons might be urged for not fortifying the eastern coast of *Nova Scotia* (on account of the neighbouring isles defending it, or

\* Besides, instead of depriving the *English* of the lands, if any *French* remained in the country, two years after the treaty, they became the property of the *English* by the 14th article of it.