our men[3]—it seems, all climates are not equally good for conquest—Alexander and Cæsar would have looked wretchedly after a yellow fever! A hero that would have leaped a rampart, would perhaps have shuddered at the thought of being scalped. Glory will be taken in its own way, and cannot reconcile itself to the untoward barbarism of America. In short, if we don't renounce expeditions, our history will be a journal of miscarriages. What luck must a general have that escapes a flux, or being shot abroad—or at home! How fatal a war has this been! From Pondicherry to Canada, from Russia to Senegal, the world has been a great bill of mortality! The King of Prussia does not appear to have tapped his campaign yet— He was slow last year; it is well if he concludes this as thunderingly as he did the last.

Our winter-politics are drawn to the dregs. The King is gone to Kensington,[4] and the Parliament is going out of town.[5] The ministers who don't agree, will, I believe, let the war decide their squabbles[6] too. Mr Pitt will take Canada and the Cabinet Council together, or miscarry in both. There are Dutch deputies[7] here, who are likely to be here some time: their negotiations are not of an epigrammatic nature, and we are in no hurry to decide on points[8] which we can-

coasts' (*London Chronicle* 5–8 May, v. 436).

2. 27 Feb. (ibid.).

3. 'The troops are extremely sickly' (ibid.).

4. 'His Majesty with the Court removed yesterday from St James's to Kensington' (*Daily Adv.* 25 April).

5. It was prorogued 2 June (*post* 1 June 1759).

6. 'There is a disunion in the administration which may soon end in a breach' (Newcastle's 'Considerations on the Present State of Affairs at Home and Abroad,' 18–19 April, BM Add. MSS 32890, f. 137). Pitt blamed Newcastle and Legge for the 'low state of credit, the unexampled fall of stocks,' charging them with 'negligence, ignorance, or ill-management of the Treasury,' and 'delay, procrastination, or uncertainty in their taxes or raising the money' (ibid. ff. 138, 140). Newcastle called Pitt the 'person who by his own measures has thrown the nation into an immense expense which it cannot support, and caused such drains of money out of the kingdom which cannot be supplied,' claiming that Pitt, though fully informed of the 'true state of the finances,' failed to recognize the 'impossibility of going on another year' (ibid. ff. 139–40).

7. Jacob Boreel (1711–78), Dutch ambassador to England 1761–2; Jan van de Poll (?1721–?1801); and Gerard Meerman (1722–71), scholar (*Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder*, Vol. II, ed. Friedrich Hausmann, Zurich, 1950, p. 245; A. J. van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, Haarlem, 1852–78, ii. 284, viii pt ii. 149–50, ix pt iii. 119). They arrived 9 April (*London Chronicle* 10–12 April, v. 343); their first audience was 17 April (a translation of their speech to George II is ibid. 28 April – 1 May, v. 412); their departure was rumoured ibid. 8–10 May, v. 445 and denied 10–12 May, v. 447, their instructions are quoted 12–15, 17–19 May, v. 455, 476; see also *ante* 5 May 1759.

8. The Dutch deputies insisted upon the immediate release of all Dutch vessels detained by the British and the granting of the status of most favoured nation to the