

his friends as much of the public money, wrung from an overburthened country, as he may have the address to get hold of? how could it be imagined that he would scruple to employ the most unjustifiable means to obtain that membership of which he makes so unjustifiable a use. Great pains are however taken to keep the public ignorant that such means are resorted to; for besides that, there is no man, however wicked, that is so utterly regardless of the good opinion of his fellow creatures as to avow his wickedness in the face of day; there happens to be a law against their employment, which it would not be very convenient to come under the operation of. This law it is true, is very rarely brought into action; its provisions may be easily evaded by a man ordinarily skilled in Electioneering tactics, and unless the proofs of its infraction be so clear and strong, that to overlook them would be tantamount to an open confession, in the face of the country, of the most shameful corruption, it is suffered to slumber quietly in the Statute Book. But the motives, strong as they are, which prompt to the concealment of Electioneering manœuvres, will sometimes be overpowered by other motives, and this was the case in reference to the business of which we are now to give an account.

At the last election for the boroughs which Mr Hume represents, there was a rival candidate of the name of Mitchell, who is stated to be a great and opulent Russian merchant in London. He employed as his agent, a Mr Innes, Writer to the Signet, by whom no exertions seem to have been spared to dispossess Mr Hume of the seat which he wished his client to fill. For this purpose, two actions were raised in the Court of Session for nullifying the vote which Montrose had given in favour of Mr Hume. These however, were unsuccessful, as well as a petition, presented by Mr Mitchell against Mr Hume's Election to the House of Commons. When a bad business is in hand, there will never be wanting tools to work for hire. Patrick Mason, some time Dean of Guild in Montrose, and John Mill, a Flaxdresser there, lent their names to a petition and complaint for setting aside an election of the Town Council of Montrose, with the view of overturning Mr Hume's Election. The former was induced to turn traitor to his townsmen by the promise of an appointment under Government, and the treachery of the latter, was purchased by a supply—to what amount is unknown—of flax.

In the various attempts to dispossess Mr Hume of his seat, a considerable expence was incurred, which Mr Mitchell having been in no haste to defray, his Agent has had recourse to legal measures, and issued a summons for payment of part of the expences of the canvass by Mr Mitchell against Mr Hume in 1820. By this proceeding, which throws a good deal of light on the dark transaction to which it refers, we learn that the Lord Advocate and Lord Melville were aiders and abettors in the design formed to exclude Mr Hume from the House! And why? because he raised his voice against the plunder of the public money,—one of the strongest recommendations to a seat in the House which any member can pos-