

Have I given any symptoms of an avaricious disposition? Have I obtained any grants from the Crown since I have been placed at the head of the treasury? Has my conduct been different from that which others in the same station would have followed? Have I acted wrong in giving the place of auditor to my son and in providing for my own family? I trust that their advancement will not be imputed to me as a crime unless it shall be proved that I placed them in offices of trust and responsibility for which they were unfit.

But while I unequivocally deny that I am sole and prime minister, and that to my influence and direction all the measures of the government must be attributed, yet I will not shrink from the responsibility which attaches to the post I have the honor to hold; and should, during the long period in which I have sat upon this bench, any one step taken by government be proved to be either disgraceful or disadvantageous to the nation, I am ready to hold myself accountable.

To conclude, sir, though I shall always be proud of the honor of any trust or confidence from his Majesty, yet I shall always be ready to remove from his councils and presence when he thinks fit; and therefore I should think myself very little concerned in the event of the present question if it were not for the encroachment that will thereby be made upon the prerogatives of the Crown. But I must think that an address to his Majesty to remove one of his servants, without so much as alleging any particular crime against him, is one of the greatest encroachments that was ever made upon the prerogatives of the Crown. And therefore, for the sake of my master, without any regard for my own, I hope all those that have a due regard for our constitution and for the rights and prerogatives of the Crown, without which our constitution cannot be preserved, will be against this motion.

WILLIAM PULTENEY

WILLIAM PULTENEY, an English politician of the Whig stripe, who flourished in the reigns of Queen Anne and the first two Georges, was born in 1684, and died in 1764. He was a man of considerable education and ability, a good classic, and possessed of a keen and incisive eloquence, and much vivacity of manner. He entered parliament in 1705 as Whig member for Hedon, in Yorkshire, and took a conspicuous part first in support and in defence of Sir Robert Walpole, and latterly as leader of the opposition in Parliament that denounced him. On the accession of George I, he became secretary of war and was made a privy counselor; but when Walpole became prime minister and made no post for his defender, Pulteney, though he was offered a peerage, went over to the opposition and wrote several bitter pamphlets against Walpole. Besides his authorship of various political pasquinades, he was Bolingbroke's chief assistant in contributing to a periodical of the time known as "The Craftsman." When Walpole retired in 1741, Pulteney was the actual framer of the new cabinet, although the Earl of Wilmington was its nominal head. Very soon after this event he was made Earl of Bath, but his transference to the House of Lords practically destroyed his political influence. He spoke but seldom in Parliament after this, but devoted himself mainly to literary pursuits, enjoying great popularity in literary circles until his death in London, July 7, 1764. Pulteney was a brilliant orator, possessing great versatility, and was witty and direct in argument, but as a politician suffered himself to be swayed by the spirit of faction rather than by true patriotic sentiment. There is a good story related of Walpole, when both he and Pulteney were relegated to the House of Lords, the former as Earl of Orford and the latter as Earl of Bath. Walpole, meeting in the Upper House for the first time his quondam friend, facetiously exclaimed: "Here we are, my lord, the two most insignificant fellows in England!"

ON A MOTION FOR REDUCING THE ARMY

SIR,—We have heard a great deal about Parliamentary armies, and about an army continued from year to year. I have always been, sir, and always shall be, against a standing army of any kind. To me it is a terrible thing, whether under that of Parliamentary or any other designation. A standing army is still a standing army, whatever name it be called by. They are a body of men distinct from the body of the people; they are governed by different laws; and blind obedience and an entire submission to the

orders of their commanding officer is their only principle. The nations around us, sir, are already enslaved and have been enslaved by these very means: by means of their standing armies they have every one lost their liberties. It is indeed impossible that the liberties of the people can be preserved in any country where a numerous standing army is kept up. Shall we, then, take any of our measures from the examples of our neighbors? No, sir, on the contrary, from their misfortunes we ought to learn to avoid those rocks upon which they have split.

It signifies nothing to tell me that our army is commanded by such gentlemen as cannot be supposed to join in any measures for enslaving their country. It may be so. I hope it is so! I have a very good opinion of many gentlemen now in the army. I believe they would not join in any such measures. But their lives are uncertain, nor can we be sure how long they may be continued in command; they may be all dismissed in a moment, and proper tools of power put in their room.

Besides, sir, we know the passions of men; we know how dangerous it is to trust the best of men with too much power. Where was there a braver army than that under Julius Cæsar? Where was there ever an army that had served their country more faithfully? That army was commanded generally by the best citizens of Rome—by men of great fortune and figure in their country; yet that army enslaved their country.

The affections of the soldiers toward their country, the honor and integrity of the under officers, are not to be depended on. By the military law the administration of justice is so quick, and the punishments so severe, that neither officer nor soldier dares offer to dispute the orders of his supreme commander; he must not consult his own inclinations. If an

officer were commanded to pull his own father out of this House, he must do it; he dares not disobey; immediate death would be the sure consequence of the least grumbling. And if an officer were sent into the Court of Requests, accompanied by a body of musketeers with screwed bayonets, and with orders to tell us what we ought to do, and how we were to vote, I know what would be the duty of this House; I know it would be our duty to order the officer to be taken and hanged up at the door of the lobby. But, sir, I doubt much if such a spirit could be found in the House, or in any House of Commons that will ever be in England.

Sir, I talk not of imaginary things. I talk of what has happened to an English House of Commons and from an English army; and not only from an English army, but an army that was raised by that very House of Commons, an army that was paid by them, and an army that was commanded by generals appointed by them. Therefore do not let us vainly imagine that an army raised and maintained by authority of Parliament will always be submissive to them. If an army be so numerous as to have it in their power to overawe the Parliament, they will be submissive as long as the Parliament does nothing to disoblige their favorite general; but when that case happens I am afraid that, in place of Parliament's dismissing the army, the army will dismiss the Parliament, as they have done heretofore. Nor does the legality or illegality of that Parliament, or of that army, alter the case. For with respect to that army, and according to their way of thinking, the Parliament dismissed by them was a legal Parliament; they were an army raised and maintained according to law; and at first they were raised, as they imagined, for the preservation of those liberties which they afterward destroyed.

It has been urged, sir, that whoever is for the Protestant succession must be for continuing the army: for that very reason, sir, I am against continuing the army. I know that neither the Protestant succession in his Majesty's most illustrious house, nor any succession, can ever be safe so long as there is a standing army in the country. Armies, sir, have no regard to hereditary successions. The first two Cæsars at Rome did pretty well, and found means to keep their armies in tolerable subjection, because the generals and officers were all their own creatures. But how did it fare with their successors? Was not every one of them named by the army, without any regard to hereditary right or to any right? A cobbler, a gardener, or any man who happened to raise himself in the army and could gain their affections, was made emperor of the world. Was not every succeeding emperor raised to the throne, or tumbled headlong into the dust, according to the mere whim or mad frenzy of the soldiers?

We are told this army is desired to be continued but for one year longer, or for a limited term of years. How absurd is this distinction! Is there any army in the world continued for any term of years? Does the most absolute monarch tell his army that he is to continue them any number of years, or any number of months? How long have we already continued our army from year to year? And if it thus continues, wherein will it differ from the standing armies of those countries which have already submitted their necks to the yoke? We are now come to the Rubicon. Our army is now to be reduced, or never will. From his Majesty's own mouth we are assured of a profound tranquillity abroad, and we know there is one at home. If this is not a proper time, if these circumstances do not afford us a safe opportunity for reducing at least a part of our regular forces, we never can expect to

see any reduction. This nation, already overburdened with debts and taxes, must be loaded with the heavy charge of perpetually supporting a numerous standing army, and remain forever exposed to the danger of having its liberties and privileges trampled upon by any future king or ministry who shall take in their head to do so and shall take a proper care to model the army for that purpose.