

some neighbours, we might as well apply this doctrine to every colony the French are possessed of, and even to France itself. But did the possession of Canada give the French any superiority over us, either on the principles of power or commerce? Was it not our own unparalleled negligence that raised them from the very extremity of beggary and contempt, and made them become formidable to us? It cannot be said, Sir, that before the French got possession of the lakes, and prevailed upon our Indian allies to abandon our interest, and take part with them, that England had any thing to apprehend from the excessive growth of French power from that colony, so far from this, did not our own colonies hold Canada in such a piteous light, that they seldom engaged vigorously in a war against it? When they were inclined to correspond with Canada in this manner, did they not set the Indians on; and did not they alone prove sufficient to keep the Canadians in the most abject awe and subjection?

But wherefore should I be surprized at finding Canada ever so deficient for England, in a commercial view, or even of any importance at all, when we have been very modestly given to understand that the "proposed demand of Canada is," partly "founded on the little value of" it "to the French \*;" an assertion so plain and simply honest in itself, that I believe, Sir, I had no occasion to have enlarged in the manner I have done: however, as I have entered the lists, it is fit I should acquit myself with becoming courage and resolution, and shall, therefore proceed on the object of contention. Another part of the foundation is said to be "the right we have to ask, and the power we may have to insist on an indemnification for our

\* Interest of Great Britain, p. 4, and 5.