

As to the Exposition given in the *French Memorial* of the XVth Article of the *Treaty of Utrecht*, the Court of *Great-Britain* cannot conceive that it is authorized either by the Expressions, or Intention of that Article.

1<sup>st</sup>, The Court of *Great-Britain* cannot admit that this Article respects only the Persons of the *Indians*, and not their Country. The Words of the Treaty are clear and precise, viz. That the *Five-Nations* or Cantons of *Indians* are Subject to the Dominion of *Great-Britain*; which, according to the received Explanation of all Treaties, ought to respect the Country, as well as the Persons of the *Indians*. This *France* has acknowledged in the most solemn Manner. They considered well the Importance of this Acknowledgment, at the Time of signing the Treaty; and *Great-Britain* will never go back from it. The Country possessed by these *Indians* is very well known, and is not so indeterminate, as is pretended in the Memorial. They possess and transfer Property as other Proprietors generally do every where else.

2<sup>d</sup>, *Great-Britain* never pretended that the Land where an *Indian* made but a transient Residence, should belong to the Crown of which he was a Subject or Alley.

3<sup>d</sup>, However free and independent the *Indians* in Question may be (which is a Point the Court of *Great-Britain* will not undertake to discuss\*) they ought to be looked upon as the Subjects of *Great-Britain*, and treated as such by the *French* in particular, as they are solemnly bound by the Treaty of *Utrecht*, renewed and confirmed in a better Manner by that of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, to look upon them as such. The Nature of Things is not changed by † the Treaty of *Utrecht*. The same People, the same Country always exists: But the Acknowledgment made by *France* of the Subjection of the *Iroquois* to the *British* Nation, is a perpetual Proof of their Right in this Particular, which can never be disputed with them by *France*.

\* And with good Reason, notwithstanding the Point is decisive. For, if the *Indians* are independent, they are not then the Subjects of *England*.

† They would undoubtedly have said since.