

County, it is true, but his resignation might happen at a very unseasonable period, and before the vacancy were filled up, business, deeply affecting us, might pass without our opinion being known. It would be more reasonable, then, to have a Representative of whose steadiness we shall have some better assurance, than what the past conduct and future prospects of the Hon. W. Gordon affords. Let us turn next to his conduct in the late Parliament, and, as might be expected when his brother was in office, in every division at which he happened to be present, he voted with the Ministers. Not one motion for economy and retrenchment, which did not emanate from them, met with his support. But as a sample of his principles, I shall refer you to the last three votes which he gave : When the Reform Bill was to be read a second time, and long and anxiously debated, it was generally understood that those who were favourable to Reform, but yet who might object to what they termed the sweeping nature of the Bill, would not oppose the second reading, but, in the committee, contend against those details which seemed unnecessary or unjust. The principle of the Bill was the necessity of Reform ; those who voted against the second reading, did in fact vote that Reform was not necessary. The name of the Hon. W. Gordon is to be found in the list of those who voted against Reform. Whatever professions he may now make—however friendly to the measure he may now declare himself—when we have now positive and unfaillable proof that he is an enemy to Reform of any kind. Had he been friendly to what is called moderate Reform, he would