

Those that bring forward this objection about the loss of the influence of property, likewise add that the relation that ought to subsist between landlord and tenant, and the good feeling that ought to bind them together, would be destroyed by the ballot. Now, the good feeling is all on one side, for if the landlord get his own way, he is on the best of terms with his perjured tenant. But is the tenant on the best of terms with himself for perjury, or is the country the better of such a voter? The relation between landlord and tenant, is, when translated, this: that the tenant must do as the landlord bids, or be oppressed. It is to get rid of this relation and disinterested good feeling, that the ballot is principally urged.

IV. *Badgering the candidate.* I believe it was the late Mr Huskisson that brought forward as an argument against the ballot, his admiration of the system of badgering the candidate at an open election. This species of fun, the retrospection of which is, I suspect, more agreeable to honourable members than the actual endurance, may be of some service under the present system, but I do not see in it any thing so intrinsically good as to make it essentially necessary at an election. It no doubt is annoying to the candidate to answer for the past and speak for the future, but he knows very well that he has only to endure with patience and equanimity for a few days the questions of well-fed yeomen and fat burghers, and the practical drollery of the drunken riff-raff, and his comfort is secure for seven long years to come. Immediately after the election is over, he shews his back to his constituents, and he pays himself to his own content for the trouble and jokes he has endured. Now, I do think we would be as well rid of this expensive fun, as

it turns out in the end to be, and I would like some other recommendations in a candidate than his adroitly turning a question, his giving occasion for a jest or squib, his endurance of cabbage and filth, and his love for the public money. A man knowing that he was coming under the ordeal of the ballot, would find in every secret vote a home question that could not be parried or evaded like the babble of some self-vain and officious common councilman or petty squire. In fact, no one guilty of dishonesty towards his constituents would run the risk of his disgrace, where his conduct was to be tried by the ballot. Yet there are many who think highly of this badgering, and who, in seeing the candidate put to his marrow bones, believe that they witness the sturdy independence of the voter, and his power over his representative. Even in the drunken waggery of the mob, in the riot and saturnalian confusion of an election, they think they see an embodying of the glorious majesty of the people, and they praise the straight-forward truly English system of open voting. If these men knew to prefer order to confusion, peace to riot, decency to indecency, they would see that the ballot is preferable to open voting.

V. *Porter and expenses—public morals.* I do not think it necessary to reason with those who languish after the arms of "the Red Lion flaring o'er the way," or who lament the loss of "Calvert's butt, and Parson's black champagne." Nor do I think it necessary to waste a word upon those who think that the candidate should pay well for his seat, and that the best way of keeping down the aristocracy, is to ruin them by an election. The public pay for this ruin by having the candidate and his relations quartered upon them, and the whole public are paying a