

CAPTAIN GORDON

“A Practical Reformer.”

AND so Captain Gordon, according to the *Journal*, “is a practical Reformer,” ready to remove every proved abuse. Really, this is something quite new, and much more extraordinary even than the announcement of the “rival candidate.” But what does Henry Lumsden, Dr. Morison, Mr. Farquharson, and the rest of them, say to this declaration of conformity? Are they ready to give the gallant Captain full powers to support practical measures of Reform? “Oh no!” the *Journal* would answer, if it spoke honestly—“no such thing; this is merely an electioneering trick. The Captain is not a Reformer—he is as inveterate a Tory as ever he was; but you know we want him returned, and nothing now-a-days will go down with the constituencies but Reform real or professed.” This would be the *Journal's* answer, if it had honesty to speak out; but as it has not, we must do the best we can to let the Electors know the truth.

The best way to judge in a case of this kind is to look to the past conduct of the man, examine his votes in Parliament, and ascertain the company he keeps. If he be a practical Reformer, how is it that he has never said so himself—that he has always voted against every measure of practical Reform—and that he is supported and caressed by the declared foes of improvement? It is idle, in fact, to talk seriously of Captain Gordon being a Reformer; he would deny it himself if it were put to him, *on his honour*, even during the election contest. But what light does his past conduct throw on the subject? Where are the proofs of his advocacy of practical Reform? Behold a few of them.

On the 22d of March, 1831, the principle of the Reform Bill was carried by a majority of one, 301 voting for, and 300 against it. Your practical Reformer, Captain Gordon, was one of the 300!

On the 19th of April, he supported General Gascoyne's amendment, the object of which was to defeat the great measure.

On the 6th of July, he voted against the second reading of the Reform Bill.

On the 19th of the same month, he again recorded his hostility to Reform.

On the 23d day of September, he voted against the Scotch Reform Bill, that measure which gave political existence to the great majority of those whose suffrage he is now demanding.

On the 17th of January, 1832, he again voted against the second reading of the Reform Bill.

On the 23d of March, he voted against the third reading.

And, on the 30th of May, he voted against the second reading of the Irish Reform Bill.

These are only a few proofs, picked out here and there, of the determined perseverance with which this practical Reformer opposed the passing of the great measure of practical reform. But why should we produce these instances? Does not every elector in the County know that the gallant Captain was neither more nor less than the representative in the Lower House of a noble Duke, who, in the Upper House, declared his hostility to the Reform Bill, even after the majority of the Peers had agreed to allow it to pass? And does not every elector know that Captain Gordon has, at all times, set himself in opposition to every liberal and enlightened measure that his Majesty's Government have brought forward. He voted against the admission of Dissenters to the Universities; against the removal of Jewish disabilities; against an inquiry into the bribery and corruption that had been practised during an election at Liverpool; against the Irish Tithe Bill, even when it had no appropriation clause; and he could not help carping and showing his teeth when the Scotch Burgh Reform Bill was proposed. A practical Reformer, forsooth! We do not believe that he ever said a single word in favour of Reform of any kind since he was sent to Parliament, or that he ever gave a vote, unless for some party purpose, that had the slightest tendency to advance the true interests of the people.

It is almost enough to put conformity out of fashion, even among the most brazen-faced Tories, to see the mask assumed by such a person as Captain Gordon.