

sess. And by what means was his expulsion to be effected? by means of that very *money*, for endeavouring to protect which, from dilapidation, he incurred the hatred of his opponents. We defy any man to bring forward a stronger argument for Parliamentary reform than is furnished by the following extract from a letter of Mr Mitchell to his Agent, written after an unsuccessful application to the Lord Advocate and Lord Melville for pecuniary assistance. "I feel," he says, "that they do not behave well to me in this business; for at their urgent entreaties I petitioned against the late election at an expense to me of more than £2,000, and now they will give no assistance towards removing a GREAT NUISANCE, and what has, and will prove a thorn in their sides." In another letter from Mr Mitchell to his Agent, after mentioning that Lord Melville complained of the want of funds to defray such charges as had arisen out of the opposition to Mr Hume; he adds "*Entre nous*, they (the Lord Advocate and Lord Melville) are at a loss for funds to pay expences already incurred, **FOR JOSEPH HUME AND COMPANY PRY INTO EVERY CHARGE FOR SCOTLAND**"! Can any thing be more complimentary to Mr Hume, than the way in which he is here sneered at by the supporters of that rapacity which it was the object of his exertions to repress. But to how fearful a height must corruption have arrived in a country where persons holding high official situations can entertain the design of prostituting its funds to such *purposes* as are here alluded to.

The subordinate actors in this Electioneering drama have not been treated with more good faith than their principal. While the proceedings before the Court of Session were depending the *quondam* Dean of Guild complained that he had not been properly supported from London, and was about to withdraw the action, but having received through the medium of the lawyer a written obligation to relieve him of all expences, he allowed it to go on. His appointment however, under government, never took place, and the only reward he met with for allowing his name to be used in the petition, is thus stated in the summons,—"*He exposed himself and his family to the rage of the opposite faction, and for a considerable time they were exposed to the insults of the whole inhabitants of Montrose, and his life was often in imminent danger, and his credit and business were almost entirely ruined.*"

As for Mill, when the action terminated, he had £28 of expences to pay to the opposite party, and not having taken Mason's precaution of getting an obligation of relief, "*he was actually incarcerated, and remained a prisoner in the gaol of Montrose a considerable time.*" The £28 was at length paid by some *unknown* hand. The narrative of the summons is thus concluded,—"*Although the said Patrick Mason and John Mill, by the foresaid obligation and promises were induced to lend their names to serve the political views of the said John Mitchell, Lord Melville, and the Lord Advocate, and were ruined in their business and credit in consequence, yet they never got the least redress in any shape whatever, and all applications on their part have been entirely neglected.*"