

nation was seldom involved in a direct war with the French in the latter, only to humour the Five Nations who at that time over-awed all Canada. They had done us much injury in Newfoundland and St. Christopher's: these were quietly given up to us, without the least difficulty. What more then could we require? And yet, Sir, these were terms granted only to draw us off from a confederacy, which, upon our defection, was still able to have over-run all France; a confederacy, Sir, that, bent upon the total subversion of France, was then carrying on the war against her with the utmost rigour, and for which we had, notwithstanding, procured a most advantageous barrier, *at the good liking* of our gracious queen, from those very enemies which it was treating so unmercifully.

What, Sir, can I think, when I have seen these insinuations prevail; when I have seen England have forty thousand men idle the greatest part of a year, and no expedition undertaken to oppress the common enemy! Does it not seem as if moderation was adopted? If it was deemed so very dangerous to our continental affairs, to send any forces upon a foreign attempt, might they not have been employed on the French coast? While the war lasts, it must be just to exert ourselves to the utmost against our common enemies, and to do them the greatest detriment we can: it is even incumbent on us, in order to put a speedy conclusion to it; especially when we find, that if these enemies submit to a peace, it will be, because they cannot carry on the war any longer. Might not our large useless fleets at the Leeward Islands be employed in destroying the French forts at Grenade and Cayenne? Might we not

U

bombard