



408. Hamilton.

Sir Sandford Fleming

W. R. H. Lord Fitzroy Somerset
LL.B.
NO MISTAKE:

OR,

Anti Author

A VINDICATION

OF THE

Sir Sandford Fleming

NEGOTIATORS OF THE TREATY OF 1783,

RESPECTING THE

NORTH EASTERN BOUNDARY

OF THE

UNITED STATES.

IN A CONVERSATION

BETWEEN

JOHN BULL AND JONATHAN.

By W. R. HAMILTON, F.R.S.

PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM NICOL, 60, PALL MALL.

1842.

NOTICE.

THE greater part of the facts and arguments in the following sheets are drawn from, or suggested by the Reports and Documents prepared for Parliament by Messrs. Featherstonehaugh and Mudge.

April, 1842.

CONVERSATION
RESPECTING THE
NORTH EASTERN BOUNDARY
OF THE
UNITED STATES.

JOHN BULL — JONATHAN.

J. B. Well, Jonathan, how are you going on? how are all friends on the banks of the Potowmack?

Jon. Very bad.

J. B. How so? What's the matter?

Jon. These eternal misunderstandings between our two Governments.

J. B. What are they discussing now?

Jon. Oh, there's the Caroline affair, not yet cleared up, the Slavery question, the Creole business, the right of Visit, the N. W. Boundary, and the N. E. Boundary of our States.

J. B. As for most of these subjects of difference, I don't think you need fret about them much just now. The Caroline affair is almost forgotten, and on both sides of the border there has been a good deal of giving and taking, with and without law; besides you have tried and acquitted M'Leod, and there's an end of it: the Slavery question will soon settle itself, as the Blacks are likely enough to take the law into their own hands;

the Creole affair, and the conduct of our officers at Nassau will be adjudged in our courts according to Law; the Right of Visit, which you talk so loud about, is nothing more than the adherence to the practice of Ships-of-war in all times, as the only means of ascertaining that a trader met at sea has a *bonâ fide* right to the flag she bears, by which practice pirates are kept down, and lawful commerce, your's with the rest, protected for the benefit of all nations; as to your N. W. Boundary, it is so distant, and the claims on both sides are of such a complicated nature, that I see no chance of their being brought to an end for some years to come. In the meantime our respective interests in that part of the world are not of that immediate importance to cause any great anxieties about the result. But I cannot understand why the question of the North Eastern Boundary of your States has not been settled long since.

Jon. That's the most difficult of all.

J. B. Why so?

Jon. Because we have told you where the real boundary is, and we have had it surveyed, and we are all of the same mind; that is to say, the line we point out is the right one, we have over and over again said it must be so, and still your government is so unreasonable as to pretend that we are quite wrong, and want to cajole you out of your rights.

J. B. But the treaty is in English, and we both speak the same language; where's the difficulty?

Jon. There is no difficulty at all, if you will but read the words and interpret their meaning, as Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Gallatin, Mr. Adams, and all our best statesmen, have explained them.

J. B. Well, where is this Treaty? Let us read it over quietly by ourselves, and try to make it out according

to the plain meaning of the words ; which must of course be that of the negotiators who used them.

Jon. The words of the IInd. Article of the treaty of 1783, which relate to our boundaries to the North and East, are as follows :

“ That all disputes which might arise in future on the subject of
 “ the boundaries of the said United States may be prevented, it is
 “ hereby agreed and declared, that the following are and shall be
 “ their boundaries, viz. *From the North West Angle of Nova Scotia,*
 “ *viz. that Angle, which is formed by a line drawn due north from the*
 “ *Source of St. Croix River to the Highlands, along the said High-*
 “ *lands, which divide those rivers which empty themselves into the*
 “ *River St. Lawrence, from those which fall into the Atlantic Ocean,*
 “ *to the North-westernmost head of the Connecticut River ; thence*
 “ *down along the middle of that river to the 45th degree of North*
 “ *Latitude ;* * * * * *
 * * * * * *East, by a line to be drawn along the middle of the*
 “ *River St. Croix from its mouth in the Bay of Fundy to its source,*
 “ *and from its source directly North to the aforesaid Highlands which*
 “ *divide the rivers that fall into the Atlantic Ocean from those which*
 “ *fall into the River St. Lawrence, comprehending all islands within*
 “ *twenty leagues of any part of the Shores of the United States, and*
 “ *lying between lines to be drawn due East from the points where*
 “ *the aforesaid boundaries between Nova Scotia on the one part, and*
 “ *East Florida on the other, shall respectively, touch the Bay of*
 “ *Fundy and the Atlantic Ocean, excepting such islands as now are,*
 “ *or heretofore have been within the limits of the said province of*
 “ *Nova Scotia.*”

Now in the first place, friend Bull, we Americans maintain that the great, and indeed the only important part of the above stipulations still to be settled, is to ascertain which, and where, are the Highlands or line of Highlands intended by the Negotiators ; i. e. which line of Highlands between the Atlantic and the St. Lawrence, answers to the description given of them in the words “ which divide those Rivers, which empty them-

“ selves into the St. Lawrence from those which fall into
“ the Atlantic.”

J. B. I understand, but how did you find the N. W. angle of Nova Scotia? That stands first in the Treaty.

Jon. This angle is still to be looked for: because although we know the Western *side* of it, viz. the due North Line, we have still to fix the base, on which that due North line is to strike.

J. B. And how did you get at that due North line?

Jon. About ten years after the peace of 1783 a joint commission was appointed, to ascertain in the first place, which was the source of the St. Croix River intended by the Treaty; the Surveyors went, or affected to go over the whole ground; and very luckily for us you consented, after some haggling, that the northernmost source of the St. Croix should be taken as the point in question; and though the western sources of that river come from the highest hills, and supply the largest stream, and though they marked the boundary of the country in former times, and though you lost more than a million of acres by that arrangement, no doubt is now thrown upon its validity by either of the parties: and there is, therefore, no further question as to the due north line, which forms the western side of the N. W. angle of Nova Scotia.

J. B. That being so, how did you proceed to ascertain the Northern *side* of the N. W. angle of Nova Scotia?

Jon. We managed that affair pretty well too, as far at least as it went, but this is still the main gist of the question, and your people are so very obstinate they wo'nt hear reason.

J. B. Well, but what did you do?

Jon. A joint commission was formed after the treaty of Ghent to survey the country, and we laid it down as the first principle, on which the Commission was to conduct

its proceedings, that as both parties were already well acquainted with all the Rivers which flowed through our respective countries southwards, i. e. the Kennebec and the Penobscot, into the Atlantic, and the St. Croix and St. John's into the Bay of Fundy, all that was wanting to settle the dispute, was to follow up the due north line from the Northern Source of the St. Croix, until we should find Rivers, or the heads of Rivers, emptying themselves northerly into the St. Lawrence, and there we said must necessarily be the line of Highlands dividing the waters according to the Treaty; and the prolongation of those Highlands to the East of the due North line would of course form the North side of the North west angle of Nova Scotia.

J. B. But what did *our* Commissioners say to this first principle of your's?

Jon. Oh! they agreed to it without hesitation, and said it was an excellent idea.

J. B. And what was the result?

Jon. Plain enough. After journeying northwards for seventy or eighty miles, we of course found one of these streams flowing into the St. Lawrence, namely, the Metis, the source of which lay about thirty miles south of the St. Lawrence, near the 68th meridian: from this point, at which we consider the exploratory North line to have terminated, we commenced an examination (rather cursory to be sure), of the country about fifteen or twenty miles south of the St. Lawrence, in a westerly direction; and observing where some waters flowed northwards and others southwards, we were perfectly justified in deciding this to be the line of dividing Highlands intended by the treaty; and our Surveyors laid them down as a succession of heights from the 68th to the 71st meridian; the heights being here not more than twenty

or twenty-five miles south of Quebec. From this point it was *necessary to find* a continuation of Highlands to meet the culminating range of the real High Lands, where are the sources of the Kennebec and Penobscot, in order to connect this new boundary line of ours with that range, and then continue it along those well known High Lands to the westernmost source of the Connecticut. You will see *this connecting line of hills* laid down on our Mr. Burnham's maps, if those maps are not all destroyed: the hills indeed have since been proved to be fictitious, but we consider ourselves entitled to maintain, and we do maintain (and we have got Mr. Gallatin, and other great and straightforward statesmen on our side,) that it is not at all necessary now to find Highlands dividing rivers according to the treaty; and that the mere fact of rivers or streams being so divided, of which those flowing northwards empty themselves into the St. Lawrence, proves that this dividing ground however low, or swampy, or however few and unconnected the elevated points upon it may be, is still nevertheless, for the purposes of the treaty, *a range of Highlands dividing* the rivers which empty themselves into the St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Atlantic.

J. B. I admire your ingenuity and your candour, but let me in my turn, as I really wish to understand the matter, ask you a question or two, on the words of the treaty.

In the first place I observe, that the boundaries to be described in the second article are not to be *new* boundaries, but the then existing boundaries of the United States—the words are: “The following *are* and *shall* be “their boundaries.” Consequently you cannot pretend that your Negotiators in 1783 aimed at getting as part of the American Union any territory, which was at the

time known to belong to the British Crown, as part either of Canada, or of Nova Scotia.

Jon. Certainly not! We claimed then only our own chartered rights, and we claim not an acre more now: except of course what we got by your admission of the Northern instead of the Western source of the St. Croix. The concluding words of the article deny us the possession of any islands, even should they be within our own limits, if they had ever been within those of Nova Scotia.

J. B. Agreed. The next thing I observe in the second Article, is that the starting point, from east to west, of your Northern boundary, is said to be "*From the north west angle of Nova Scotia.*" Now tell me, who first made use of that term, the N.W. angle of Nova Scotia?

Jon. The American Negotiators in 1782; when they required of Mr. Oswald in Paris, that the United States should be bounded, north by a line to be drawn *from the Northwest angle of Nova Scotia*, along the Highlands, which divide the rivers, which empty themselves into the St. Lawrence, from those that fall into the Atlantic, to the North westernmost head of the Connecticut River.

J. B. Whereabouts would this project of yours, if accepted, have placed this N.W. angle of Nova Scotia?

Jon. At the source of the St. John River.

J. B. How do you make that out?

Jon. Because, at the same time they proposed that their Eastern boundary should be the St. John from its mouth to its source; and it is evident that the terminating point of the Eastern boundary must have coincided with the starting point of the Northern boundary.

J. B. What was the issue of that proposal?

Jon. It was rejected by your Government, who would not hear of the St. John being the boundary, and substituted the St. Croix, to which we assented.

J. B. What were the grounds, which induced your Negotiators, after our rejection of the St. John as a boundary, still to speak of this angle of Nova Scotia in terms, plainly implying that *they* at least conceived there would be no difficulty in finding it?—They take it as a point already ascertained, or as very easily defined, viz. as formed by a due North line from the source of the St. Croix to *the highlands*. What was their authority for this expression?

Jon. It was the most natural definition they could make use of. It was adopted from the Royal Commissions of Montague Wilmot, Esq., in 1763, of Lord William Campbell in 1765, and of Francis Legge, Esq. in 1773, when these gentlemen were successively appointed to the Government of Nova Scotia.

J. B. What were the terms used in these Commissions?

Jon. Nova Scotia was described as bounded to the West “by the River St. Croix to its source, and by a line drawn *due North* from thence *to the southern boundary of our Colony of Quebec*.” Such due North line necessarily formed with the Southern boundary of Quebec two angles; of which the one to the East became (by *construction*) the N. W. angle of Nova Scotia.

J. B. What was this Southern boundary of the Colony of Quebec? and on what occasion was it fixed?

Jon. After the peace of 1763, by which Canada was given up to Great Britain, a Royal Proclamation was issued defining the Southern boundary of Quebec, as “from the “45 degree of N. Lat. passing along the Highlands, “which divide the Rivers that empty themselves into the “river St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Sea, “and also along the North Coast of the Bay des Chaleurs and the Coast of the Gulph of St. Lawrence to

“Cape Rosiers.” And by the Quebec Act of 1774 the same is described as containing: “all the territories, islands and countries in N. America, belonging to the Crown of Gt. Britain, bounded on the South by a line from the Bay of Chaleurs along the highlands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Sea, to a point in 45 degrees of N. Lat. on the Eastern bank of the river Connecticut.”

J. B. You have explained to me most satisfactorily the origin of the due North line, and why it was adopted in the Treaty: and you have shewn me also the identity between the S. boundary of Quebec, and the N. boundary of Nova Scotia, both of them in the line of Highlands: but what was the origin of this expression, so often repeated, “the Highlands, which divide the waters flowing into the St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Atlantic, or into the Sea?”

Jon. It was taken by your Government in 1763 from the Reports of Mr. Pownall who, when Governor of Massachusetts before and during a part of the seven year’s war, was very active in obtaining accurate intelligence, (as far as accuracy could be secured without actual survey) of the line of hills, and the courses of rivers, between the Atlantic and the St. Lawrence; mainly, we suppose, with a view to the military defence of the Colonies, or possibly to an attack on the French possessions in Canada. The result of his enquiries was sent home, and on your becoming masters of those French possessions, your Government naturally made use of his information; it being then in their power to define precisely the limits between the old Colonies and the new Conquest, when there were no national jealousies or ambitious views to detract from the one, or add to the other.

J. B. Did Governor Pownall immediately publish these geographical notices?

Jon. Not until 1776.

J. B. In what terms does he designate the Highlands you allude to?

Jon. They are correctly stated in your Commissioners' Report of July 1840: as for example. 1. "The highest part of this tract of Mountains may be defined by a line drawn N. W. from the white hills (about 44. 10.) to the 45th parallel of North Latitude: 2. Going from the same line, in Lat. 45. of the greatest height of this range of Mountains, and following them to the east northerly, they all seem to range as united, until again divided by the Bay des Chaleurs. 3. The Connecticut River rises in N. Lat. 45. 10. at the Height of the Land. 4. A range, running hence across the East boundary line of New Hampshire, in Lat. 44. 30. and trending N. E., from the height of the land between Kennebaeg and Chaudier Rivers. 5. All the heads of Kennebec, Penobscot, and Passamaquoddy (*St. Croix*) rivers, are in the height of land running E. N. E."

J. B. But if there be no doubt as to the identity between the Southern boundary of Quebec and the Highlands described by Governor Pownall, as adopted by you, and as embodied in the Treaty, in what consists the dispute between the two Countries?

Jon. Precisely in this, that you assert that Governor Pownall's Highlands, the Highlands of the Treaty, the Southern boundary of Quebec and the Northern boundary of Nova Scotia, are that line of Highlands which lies almost direct between the Source of the Connecticut, and the Western extremity of the Bay des Chaleurs, but which line we deny to be the Treaty line, because, we assume as the Highlands of the Treaty the dividing

grounds between the St. Lawrence, and the upper course of the St. John.

J. B. But I cannot understand your objection to our Highlands, which according to the latest surveys, are by far the most elevated of the two lines; from which rise the Connecticut, the Kennebec, the Penobscot and the St. Croix to the South, and the St. Francis and the Chaudiere to the North, which are notoriously *the* continuation of the culminating ridge, between the 71st and the 72nd degrees of Longitude, common to both lines, first designated by your own negotiators in 1782 as *the dividing Highlands*; whereas on the contrary the heights which your Surveyors have claimed as the Treaty line, are in many places broken, are no where of any considerable height, give rise to no considerable streams, send none whatever into the Atlantic, whatever they may do with some inconsiderable rivers that fall into the St. Lawrence, were never designated as Highlands, and above all have no connection whatever with the culminating Ridge, common to both.

Jon. But you must be aware that the Northern boundary of Massachusetts has in former times been the subject of dispute, and that we once even claimed as our own, quite up to the St. Lawrence.

J. B. These claims of yours were war claims: claims against France, as a Rival power, when she was in possession of Canada—but which were repeatedly abrogated by treaties, prior even to the peace of Utrecht; and they were not confirmed by Great Britain in 1763 on her conquest of that country: but on the contrary no time was lost after that event, in fixing the Southern boundary of Quebec, where nature had placed the Northern boundary of Massachusetts, viz. at the *Highlands*, where are the sources of all her Rivers.

Jon. But there are various English Maps, which give to our provinces a much greater extent Northwards.

J. B. You have only to look at the history of those Maps, and you will see clearly that the English and French Mapmakers up to the conquest of Canada, were in the habit of driving their respective pretensions, the one party extravagantly North, the other as extravagantly South. They are of course good for nothing as authorities.

Jon. But Mitchell's Map, with its due North line prolonged far North of the St. John: how do you get over that?

J. B. Mitchell's was one of those controversial Maps I allude to, and as it was published prior to the Treaty of 1763, such due North line cannot have any official value: besides, it proves too much even for you; for the North line is carried in it quite up to the South bank of the St. Lawrence; it has therefore no weight whatever, in support of one set of Highlands or another.

Jon. How do you explain the language held by some of the Members of your Parliament in February 1783, finding fault with the preliminary Treaty for giving to us large portions of Canada and Nova Scotia, and as bringing our boundary within twenty four miles of *Montreal*?

J. B. It is clear from the tenor of that discussion, and from the history of the preceeding negotiations, that the cessions complained of were those to the East of the Ohio on one side, and those between the Penobscot and St. Croix on the other. If the opponents of the Government could have imagined, that territory to within twenty four miles of *Quebec* had been ceded, their remonstrances would have assumed a very different tone.

Jon. All this may be perfectly true; but there is still one fact, which must for ever preclude you from making good your claim.

J. B. What is that?

Jon. Your line of Highlands loses its title to that appellation, just where it happens to be struck by the due North line drawn from the Northern sources of the St. Croix, in consequence of its being intersected by the river St. John, which rises to the North of it, forces its way through it at the Falls, and empties itself after a Southern course into the Atlantic.

J. B. Not into the "*Atlantic*," Jonathan, but into the Bay of Fundy.

Jon. But that we consider part of the Atlantic, and for this particular purpose of the Treaty we consider it identical with that Sea; the St. John, therefore, must be reckoned among the Rivers flowing into the Atlantic.

J. B. Such a confounding of terms would lead us to the greatest geographical absurdities: you might as well say that all the Rivers of Spain, instead of emptying themselves, some into the Bay of Biscay, others into the Mediterranean, and others into the Atlantic, all flowed into the latter; or that the Black Sea and Archipelago were identical with the Mediterranean, and the Baltic with the North Sea: besides which you must be aware that in this very article of the Treaty which we are discussing, the Bay of Fundy is twice mentioned, once as receiving the waters of the St. Croix, and again as joined to, and, therefore, distinguished from the Atlantic Ocean. This distinction was expressly made by the American Congress in 1779. Governor Pownall also, if I mistake not, has these words in his book: "*the Atlantic Ocean, or the Bay of Fundy*"; so that the two are notoriously distinguished both conjunctively and disjunctively. The fact, therefore, of the St. John falling into the Bay of Fundy can no more affect the line of Highlands in question, or deprive it of its grand charac-

teristic feature of dividing the Rivers falling into the Atlantic from those falling into the St. Lawrence, than the partial depression you allude to, made by the waters of the St. John, can take away its claim to be considered a continuous range of highlands from the Connecticut to the Bay of Chaleurs; and surely your best lawyers cannot pretend that our giving up the Western, and taking the Northern Head of the St. Croix, as the point, from which the due North line is to be drawn, can in any degree affect the character or general direction of the base line, towards which it is to be drawn; i. e. if you allow that the due North line would have come upon *our* Highlands in one case, you cannot deny that it does so in the other.

With all these facts and documents proving the identity between Governor Pownall's heights, the Southern boundary of Quebec, and the Northern boundary of Nova Scotia, how is it possible that your countrymen, as honest men, as not devoid of common sense, and anxious as they necessarily must be to stand well in the opinion of mankind, how is it that they still persist that the Highlands so graphically and so accurately described by geographers and by statesmen, are not the Highlands of the Treaty? particularly, since the Highlands, which some of your countrymen have attempted to raise from the Swamps, and represented on maps, once admitted as official documents, have upon stricter enquiry altogether disappeared.

Jon. Why Bull, I must confess we stand upon ticklish ground; a drowning man will catch at a straw; but when we made you believe that the smallest was the principal branch of the St. Croix, when we got your scientific Commissioners to cross the St. John in search of waters falling into the St. Lawrence, although ten or twelve

years before we had given up the boundary of that river, (as a preliminary to negotiating with you at all), when we prevailed upon you to admit that the Treaty of 1783, though worded by three of our most eminent and accomplished statesmen, was a mass of blunders, which it was impossible to put in execution, when we proved to your satisfaction that the Congress in 1779, and Messrs. Jay, Franklin and Adams, in 1782, were as ignorant of the line of boundary, which they pretended to describe, as if they had been born in the Caucasus, we really took for granted that you were greedy and hungry enough to swallow any thing we might offer you; that you thirsted after peace and good will towards all men so very patiently, that if we smote you on one cheek, you would offer the other; and we have I fear at last got for our pains a conviction that we have abused your forbearance, and that you will no longer submit to be duped by our simplicity; in other words, as you are beginning to open your eyes, it is high time for us to hold our tongues.

J. B. Well, Jonathan, as you are so very civil, I won't be hard upon you: and if you keep to your word, I think there is a fair chance of our continuing to be very good friends. But as some of your countrymen may not be so open to conviction, I shall beg leave to conclude our amicable discussion with an observation or two, which I think will tend to make more general the just views you are beginning to entertain upon this subject.

In the first place it is clear that the Negotiators in 1783 acted on both sides in good faith towards each other; and particularly you will allow that your own plenipotentiaries knew well what they were about, and you will be the first to defend them from a suspicion of any treacherous underhand dealing; to which they would

be fairly open, if it were proved that they foresaw the difficulties, which have arisen in ascertaining which was the real line of Highlands called by them in the Treaty *the Highlands*.

2. Having once given up the St. John as a boundary, these same negotiators of yours never could dream, that the next generation of American statesmen would pretend, not merely to carry the boundary to the St John, but sixty or seventy miles beyond it.

3. If your present negotiators deny our line of Highlands,* they are bound to provide us with another, equally conformable to the tenor of the Treaty, equally notorious (à priori) as the acknowledged line of boundary between Quebec and Nova Scotia—and equally pregnant in sources of rivers, to be designated respectively as the tributaries of the St. Lawrence, or as affluents of the Atlantic.

4. The great characteristic of the British line of Highlands, as a watershed between the St. Lawrence and the

* In proof of the notoriety of this range of hills being the line of boundary between Quebec and Maine, and of the very recent origin of the doubts upon that subject, I may here quote a passage from Botta's History of the American war published at Paris in 1809. vol. ii. p. 193.

“The province of Maine is traversed by a river called by the natives Kennebec. This river has its source in the mountains, which divide this province from that of Canada, and taking a S. westerly course empties itself in the sea not far from the Bay of Cascoes. On the reverse side of these mountains, opposite the sources of the Kennebec, and at no great distance from them another river rises, called the Chaudière, which falls into the St. Lawrence a little above Quebec. Between the sources of these two rivers is a mountainous and rugged tract of land, which leads from one source to the other, though much interrupted by torrents and swamps.”

Atlantic, was first officially given by the Americans in 1782 to that portion of it between the source of the St. John's and the source of the Connecticut, which is the culminating ridge of the whole range—and the same description was very naturally afterwards continued by them to the whole line.

5. No notice was taken of the fact of the northern slope supplying waters to the St. John, though this was not one of the rivers flowing into the St. Lawrence; first because the type of a part became the type of the whole; secondly, because the waters of the St. John were in limine excluded from the Treaty; and thirdly, because it was well known that the mere fact of a long range of Mountains so intersected by one or more streams does not deprive it of its characteristic feature of being a watershed.

6. The geography of the old as well as of the new world will supply us with many such instances in the configuration and distribution of the earth. I will only mention one in Asia minor, but you must look at a good Map of that country. Every one knows that the Taurus is the great dividing range between the waters flowing north and west into the Euxine and Archipelago, and those which flow south into the Pamphylian and Cilician Seas. But this Taurus is intersected towards the eastern extremity of the Peninsula by the River Sarus, or Syhoon, which comes from the Anti-Taurus in Cappadocia, forces its way through the Taurus at the Cilician gates, (as our St. John bisects the Highlands at the Falls), and passing by Adana, empties itself into the sea below Tarsus, west of the thirty-fifth meridian. Now if a Surveyor were directed to draw a due north line from the source of the Cydnus (our St. Croix) to the range of Highlands, which divided the Euxine and Archipelago waters from those of the Cilician Sea, in order to define a boundary between

Cilicia Campestris and Cilicia Trachæa (our Nova Scotia and Maine), and to fix the northwest angle of the former, he never would think of passing the Taurus, merely because he found the line of Highlands depressed where the Sarus had forced its way through it, nor would he go in search of a minor range of heights to the northward: for if he did, whatever he found in the shape of rivers running to the north or to the south, he would have entirely lost sight of the object of his expedition, namely, the N. W. angle of Cilicia Campestris; for the whole of Cilicia would be behind him, and closed in by the Taurus range—just as our province of Nova Scotia was in 1763, and therefore in 1783, terminated to the north by the line of Highlands forming the southern boundary of Quebec.

7. In this stage of the controversy, and after this plain exposition of facts, which interpret the treaty in the only plain and obvious sense which the words will bear, it can hardly be necessary to revert to the terms of the original grant of Nova Scotia to Sir Alexander Grant in 1621, by James I. But should this be the case, it may be as well to notice that the expression "*ad proximam Navium Stationem*" ought to be translated, not as our Commissioners have done, "the nearest Naval Station" or "Arsenal;"—nor as your countrymen do, "the nearest Bay," but "to the nearest *Boat Station*," i. e. to the nearest spot, where the natives in travelling between the Bay of Fundy and Quebec left the portage, and found water carriage for their merchandize down the Chaudière to the great River of Canada:" and this is again a further proof that here was to be found the line of the dividing Highlands.

8. It is clear from the foregoing, that the volumes

which have been written to prove that the language of the Treaty is unintelligible, and contradictory, to show how it *ought* to be interpreted, and to explain how this and that mistake arose, are all totally useless; the closer it is examined, the more evidently it appears that the negotiators were no blunderers, that they committed no such mistake as has been laid at their door. The line to be drawn due North from the source of the St. Croix River to the Highlands, necessarily made two angles, one to the East, the other to the West, and both parties knew that the angle to the East must be the North-west angle of Nova Scotia. No one at the time doubted what was meant by *the* Highlands, and therefore they are mentioned in the first clause in which they occur with no discriminating adjunct: the starting point once fixed, the Northern boundary is carried along the *said* Highlands—the well known characteristic of them being here added to show the grounds and propriety of this frontier line being adhered to, and as especially marking out the culminating ridge, of which it was the continuation, and towards which it was advancing. The negotiators having nothing to do with the St. John River omit all allusion to its course, or to its mouth. When they have to describe the mouth of the St. Croix, they particularize the Bay of Fundy, as receiving its waters, not the Atlantic; and when they speak of the limit or boundaries of the United States between Nova Scotia and East Florida, they describe them as respectively touching the Bay of Fundy *and* the Atlantic.

9. Perhaps after all, Jonathan, convinced as you now are, that your pretended boundary line is a mere fiction, and that you have no claim whatever beyond the line of highlands, which formed in 1783 the southern limit of the province of Quebec, you will try another tack,

and will attempt to gain your point by concessions to us on other points: you may offer for example to modify your resistance to the right of Visit, or you may propose to enact some more stringent regulations for the suppression of the Slave Trade on the coast of Africa, whether carried on by your citizens, or under your flag, or you may make a merit of assenting in silence to our enfranchisement of your Creole Cargo; and in return you may expect to get from us an accommodation on the boundary question; the country perhaps between the Highlands and the St. John's, or any part of it. But it wo'n't do: we do not like to give realities in exchange for promises, facts for words, land and water for air and bubbles; whatever engagements of the above nature you consent to this year may absolve you from accidents or misunderstanding in the next; and there will never be wanting excuses for retracting them altogether: but the land once yours, it would give us a good deal of trouble to get it back. Honesty, Jonathan, is the best policy; truth and justice are the best guides of conduct, public as well as private; eschew covetousness, keep your own, and give to the Queen what is due to her.

2691784

