

be for no other reason than might arise from an overstrained complaisance, because it would be of little value to them.

The security desirable in America, we have been informed " may be considered as of three kinds. 1st, A " security of possession that the French shall not drive " us out of the country. 2dly, A security of our planters from the inroads of the savages, and the murders " committed by them. 3dly, A security that the British nation shall not be obliged on every new war to " repeat the immense expence occasioned by this to defend its possessions in America *." I agree with the author in the propriety of these heads, but when he says that " all" these " kinds of security are obtained by subduing and retaining Canada," and that " the Indians" will have " no other Europeans near them " that can either supply them, or instigate them against " us † ;" I cannot but disagree with him there, it is an assertion altogether false and extravagant : I cannot but think the retention of this same Canada will be deficient in all these points, and that in no small measure too. The author certainly could not be so ignorant of the limits of Canada, to mean as he would seem to imply ; he could not, with any regard to candour, or with a view to benefit the subject, set up a pretence so repugnant to the intent of the French settlements in North America, and the nature of their claims there. Does France claim any right to the Ohio, as appertaining to Canada ? Does any one conceive that France would set up a claim upon a principle so absurd ? It is true the grant of Louisiana to Mons. Crozat, is not of itself, a sufficient authority to insist on any precise boundaries to

* Interest of Great Britain, p. 10.

Ibid. p. 14.