

“ of the river *St. Laurence*, as well as in *Cape-Breton*.”

Does not the plain meaning of the King's words seem to be this, “ that by the cession of *Acadia*, “ which I have agreed to in the preceding article, “ my subjects will be deprived of the communication of *Quebek* with *St. John's* river, which “ is part of *Acadia* so ceded; if therefore I should “ yield also part of *Cape-Breton*, my ships would “ be hindered, in case of a war, from getting in- “ to *St. Laurence* river, which would be the loss “ of *Canada*, as in that case my subjects could “ have no access to it.” *Louis* therefore thought it but reasonable that he should have one free passage to his northern possessions; and 'tis likely our Ministers, from the same consideration, were induced to yield him up *Cape-Breton* and the isles of *St. Laurence* gulph.

But supposing all the country to the north of the *Peninsula* was to have remained in the hands of the *French* at the treaty of *Utrecht*, *Louis XIV.* could not have had the same plea; for although his ships might be hindered from getting into the river of *St. Laurence*, yet how could *Canada* be lost, in case *St. John's* river was in his possession; since by that river the *French* could have admittance to it all the year round? It is remarkable likewise, that in this place, as elsewhere, he speaks of the cession of *Acadia* in general, without any limitation; and consequently had in view nothing less than *Acadia* in its utmost extent, such as he had

in general, and in particular those in the mouth of the river *St. Laurence*; as appears by comparing the King's answer with the proposals of *England*, art. 31. par. 4. p. 377. and art. 32. par. 4. p. 384.