

his vote, Mr. Bannerman stands convicted of as unprincipled conduct as the Elector. Nay, he is rather worse, for why did he not fulfil the condition? Besides, if such was the case, Mr. Bannerman held his seat in the House of Commons rather precariously. Accepting a vote under *any* condition is *bribery*, and would unseat a member. It also leaves room for inferring that there were other *conditional*, alias *bribed*, voters; and if there were such formerly, there may be so again—there may be some of the “938 non-respectable electors,” who have again returned Mr. Bannerman whose suffrages have been obtained under a *consideration*. With this, however, we have nothing to do; let Sir Arthur’s committee look to that. But farther, if this elector’s vote was tendered under that consideration, is not Mr. Bannerman guilty of something like *sacrilege*? Was not the character of the whole affair that of a prostitution of sacred things for selfish, wordly purposes?

But it will perhaps be said, that there was no *condition*, that Bannerman was merely drawing an inference, and assigning the best reason he could for the elector’s change of sentiment. If this was really the case, what a despicable opinion must every honest and independent man entertain of the conduct of our representative? We cannot believe that Mr. Bannerman would drag any man’s name before the public, and expose him to public opprobrium (for there could be no other object to be gained) upon mere supposition, or personal conviction. There must either have been a direct and positive understanding between Mr. Bannerman and the elector regarding the appointment alluded to, or Mr. Bannerman must have been speaking hypothetically. Let him choose either of the horns of the dilemma; but we hope, he does not in either of them *represent* the majority of the electors. We look upon the matter as a piece of silly spleen on Mr. Bannerman’s part. If he had no regard for the elector himself (as we believe the elector cares very little about his regard) he might have reflected for a moment on what might be the consequences to the elector’s son. If the young man’s father had acted imprudently and unjustifiably, it showed anything but the spirit of a man or a gentleman to do anything which might blast the prospects of an innocent individual. How would Mr. Bannerman have liked if the elector had stood forward on the hustings and reminded him that he had pocketed a sum which, with interest, now amounts to about

FIVE HUNDRED POUNDS,

which was raised by subscription in behalf of the white fishers, and which was intrusted to his care. This would have shut your mouth, Mr. Bannerman. You are pretty sensitive to the remarks made by *The Observer* respecting you, and have sometimes noticed them publicly, why did you never notice this charge, which has been so often laid against you?

Mr. Bannerman’s narration of an interview with Lord Haddington, and which was given in response to the cry of “*a blast from the trumpet!*” by an individual in the crowd, shows, at once, his vanity and his cupidity. That noble Lord wished that the Tory Magistrates, who were then in office, should remain two years after the Burgh Reform Bill had passed, in order, perhaps, that they might have time to set their house in order. To secure his object he tried to gain over the Scotch Reformers to his views, and among the rest, our “worthy representative,” as the *Journal* calls Mr. Bannerman. It seems his Lordship had *battered* our M. P. pretty freely, pronouncing him “a moderate, reasonable man!” And this gentleman having been long a dealer in the *oil* way, pocketed the hint, expecting to turn it to some account, and we now see the use he has made of it—O, Mr. Bannerman!

We beg to apologize for this long *yarn*, but the subject being *tarry*, we could not get sooner *clear* of it.