

the islands at the mouth of that river belonged to *Nova Scotia* or *Acadia*, must not the coast opposite to them have also belonged to it? Whence it is clear, that *Louis XIV.* and his Ministers at the treaty of *Utrecht*, had nothing so much in view, as to cede to *Great Britain* all the *Acadia* of his predecessor *Louis XIII.* and all the *Nova Scotia* of King *James I.* of *England*.

If no more had been ceded to *Great Britain* by the preliminary articles, than the piece of *Peninsula*, which the commissaries would put them off with, she would have had no pretence to claim those islands, as being quite out of the bounds of the part so ceded.

And if so, is it to be imagined, she would have presumed to tell *Louis XIV.* that *his subjects might enjoy the island of Cape-Breton in common with those of the Queen* \*; as it were to offer him a part of what was his own, as well by actual possession, as by such scanty cession.

In that case, would not *Louis* have rejected the proposal, not only as a *new* demand, contrary to the articles signed at *London* the 8th of *October*, 1711, (in the same manner as he did with respect to the islands in the mouth of the river *St. Laurence* † :) but also as a kind of affront offered to himself?

On the other hand, supposing things to have been in this situation, if he thought it so necessary to reserve by treaty so small a part of *Nova Scotia* or *Acadia*, as those islands, is it likely, that he would have taken less care of the by-far more valuable part, the main land? Could he without such a

\* Pieces justific. art. 31. par. 4. p. 376.

† See art. 27. par. 4. and the answer, art. 28. par. 1.