

Louisiana; the patent is couched in very obscure terms, and the original expression, in some places, very ambiguous. It tells us, one part of Louisiana is bounded by the river Illinois, but whether by the mouth or source of that river is left undetermined, and the eastern boundary is entirely so. This obscurity might be affected intentionally; and indeed with good reason: for as this settlement was an illegal usurpation, not only on the crown of Spain, but that of England, and was put in execution immediately after the treaty of Utrecht, it behoved France to keep her views in this settlement, as secret as possible. But let us only consider with a little more reflection, and the matter will illustrate itself. The Ohio is cut off from Canada by the intermediate territories of some of our colonies and the Six Nations, a people whom France has formally acknowledged by treaty to be subject to England, and whose territories extend over most of the lakes, and the circumjacent country. France therefore, could not, consistently with her former conduct, she could not, with the least colour, assume a right to the Ohio as appertaining to Canada. The nature of the French claim to all the territories they assume to themselves in Canada and Louisiana, is still a stronger evidence to my present purpose. France settles at the mouths of the two rivers St. Laurence and Mississippi, and on that foundation builds a right to the whole extent of those rivers, and their several branches, and the rivers that communicate with them; it is, in fact, the only principle on which she *can* found a right to the large territories claimed by her in North America: therefore the Illinois, Ohio, Wabache, Cherokee, and the other lesser rivers that communicate with the Mississippi were undoubtedly

G

meant

Loui-