

the object of it was known to be hopeless, unless the Tory Ministry of that day had been supported by a majority in the house, who were paid for their support by the emoluments which they and their friends derived from the places and pensions, the loans, jobs, and contracts created by the war? He would ask again—Was there any man who believed that they would have been suffered to receive those emoluments as the price of their support, if the nation had at that time been in the enjoyment of what was always their undoubted right, A REAL REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE IN PARLIAMENT? He was confident that there was not one man of good common sense and independent mind in the kingdom, who believed it.

Since the year 1780 we had had various political changes, and a variety of ministries—or, as he believed they were now called, governments. And having mentioned the word government, he would take leave, by the way, to offer a remark on the artful change in the signification of some words, and the strange use, or rather abuse of that word which had taken place in his time. When he was a young man, the persons who held high official situations under the crown, who conducted the business of the executive branch of our constitution, were called the MINISTRY—a word that means *servants*. Nobody ever thought of calling them any thing else. But how stands the case now? These gentlemen now call themselves, and have taught almost every body else, to call them the government—a word that certainly suggests the idea of *masters*. The government! He had been used to think that the government of the country was by the constitution vested in the three estates, king, lords, and commons. But, no, say the nine or ten gentlemen who possess seats in the cabinet, you are mistaken; we are the government, and the means by which we govern, are, the good things which we have at our disposal. He was sensible that the mere substitution of one word for another might seem a matter of little consequence, but, in this case, a dangerous ambiguity was artfully introduced into common language. For instance, a man was said to be no friend to government. It might be pretended that nothing more was meant, than that he was not favourable to the ministry; whereas, by mixing and confounding the old sense with the new sense of the word government, an insinuation was conveyed that he was an enemy to our constitution; to King, lords, and commons, a jacobin, a leveller, and every thing that was bad. He could not help thinking, therefore, that this mo-