

ontest about  
ourse diverted  
for we were  
don't dispute  
rance by sea  
we have been  
ink, that the  
ve made upon  
ny degree an-  
on which they  
r himself fur-  
they have not ;  
populous, and  
nt of her ar-  
nts, which are  
and fatigue to  
posed by their  
at all inferior,  
ift, is the way  
e the great end  
r coasts against  
y at liberty to  
es on to shew,  
in Germany is  
n eligible diver-  
one of the ob-  
d notwithstand-  
arguments, the  
cessful. What  
can

can he mean by eligible diversion? War itself is not eligible, when peace can be equitably preserved. But has our author pointed out, where we could have made a more eligible diversion, or has he proved that no diversion was proper? "But, says he, (p. 120) our German war is no diversion at all for the French forces," though he owns in the same breath, that it employs them. Yes, and I will add, it destroys them likewise, even without the assistance of the sword; so miserably are they supplied. To make out this notable reasoning of his, the considerer tells us, that the French leave not a man fewer upon their coasts on account of their army in Germany. Who says they have? But the considerer will find it no easy task to prove, that since the beginning of the war they have not suffered a loss of men in Germany, which the populousness of France (great as it is) will not be able for many years to repair. He never can persuade any man, who has his senses about him, that France is not become a national bankrupt, by her war in Germany; or that, had she not found diversion, or if the considerer pleases, employment for her troops in Germany, she might not still have found means to have triumphed over us in America. It will be impossible to per-