

2dly, That they discouraged the company's servants from conversing with the Indians,—whereas the French promoted an intercourse with each other as much as possible.

3dly, That the climate is much warmer, and the soil better, higher up the country, than towards the sea-side.—Yet no settlements attempted.

4thly, That the French have extended their settlements more and more: and wherever they have come near the English, they have carried most of the trade from the English,—not *vice versa*.

5thly, That the forts * pretended to be

* A great stress is laid by the advocates for exclusive companies, on the necessity of erecting forts in certain distant countries, for securing the trade to ourselves;—therefore they infer companies ought to be established in order to support this expence. A strange argument this! and a stranger inference! for if forts are necessary to be erected; against whom are they necessary? not against the people of the country who are to trade with us. That is too absurd. —We are to cultivate their friendship, and ought to ingratiate ourselves by all due acts of kindness, into their favour. But if these forts are necessary to be erected, in order to keep the whole trade to ourselves, and prevent other European nations from interfering with us; how came it then to pass, that we were some years ago so alarmed at the Ostend company, who had no forts, and no design of attacking ours? Yet it is very plain, they could carry on a trade, and even undersell the English East-India company, not