

Perhaps it may be said in answer to this, *that the sketch here presented to the publick by the French court is only a rough draught of the peace that cannot be considered as positive in any particular.* Agreed: but does not this rough draught give us the sentiments of our Minister on every point? The British Memorial takes notice particularly of other limits more northerly, and of the limits (in some degree) of the French cod fishery, but only presents us with this vague account of those of Louisiana; the same Memorial is also particular in many other respects, but this care happens to be where it is of least importance. I shall here give the fifteenth article of the peace of Utrecht, which relates to the limits of the French and English colonies, as it will throw some light on the present argument. "The subjects of France inhabiting Canada, and others, shall hereafter give no hindrance or molestation to the Five Nations or cantons of Indians, subject to the dominion of Great-Britain, nor to the other natives of America, who are friends to the same. In like manner the subjects of Great-Britain shall behave themselves peaceably towards the Americans, who are subjects or friends to France; and on both sides they shall enjoy full liberty of going and coming on account of trade. As also the natives of those countries shall with the same liberty resort as they please to the British and French colonies, for promoting trade on one side and the other, without any molestation or hindrance, either on the part of the British subjects or of the French. But it is to be exactly and distinctly settled by commissaries, who are, and who ought to be accounted the subjects and friends of Britain or of France."

This article absolutely gives up the dominion of the Five Nations to Great-Britain, the treaty of Aix le Chappelle confirmed the same, and also left the decision of the limits to commissaries; therefore does more than the British Memorial requires in the late negotiation, with respect to the southern Indians who are *only under our protection*: and yet the French no sooner signed these treaties than they immediately began to encroach. Can we expect that they should be more complaisant for the future? And especially when we give them a greater opportunity of doing it with impunity? If the treaties above-mentioned had defined the bounds of the two colonies to be the river St. Lawrence, no difficulties could have arisen: and had the British Memorial in the like manner insisted on the Mississippi being the limit of Louisiana, it would have added very much to the security of our plantations. This Memorial only mentions the King of Great-Britain's claim to the protection of the Indians in question, and consequently gives up any claim we may have to the dominion over their country, a stroke which is certainly the most impolitic that could possibly have been thought of. The nature of the European colonies in North America makes it impossible to

define