

America, that it will not do so in Britain. There may be, and in this case there is, a great difference in the circumstances of the two kingdoms, and if, as the opponents of the ballot say, the votes are all known in America notwithstanding the ballot, this merely shews that the business is not properly conducted, or that secret voting is not necessary in America. And what is the difference in the state of the two countries, which makes secret voting not so essentially necessary in America as in England? It is this: property is much more diffused there than in Britain; there is a much greater equality of wealth comparatively. There can neither, therefore, be the deprivation of food, nor the deprivation of caste, by voting for this candidate or that. The candidate can neither eject the voter from his tenement, for he is perhaps as substantial a man as himself, nor can he exclude him from a fashionable set, because in a country where wealth is so much equalized, and where there is no court to feed beggarly nobles and pamper insolence, there will be no "select world of fashion."

But whilst from these circumstances, there is not the same necessity for secret voting in America as in England, it is singular that the ballot should prevail through the greater number of the states, and be extending to others. If Jonathan has a dislike to the ballot, it is very odd indeed that he does not get rid of it. He surely cannot plead in its behalf, that it is a part of the wisdom of his ancestors, nor can any of the Americans, possessed of influence, if such there be, stickle for it as a well-working system for getting their creatures into the house of representatives. If the people are not satisfied with the ballot, they can do away with it at once. But the ballot continues, for the very

plain and obvious reason, that it answers better, in even republican America, than open voting. No doubt there may be men in America, as well as there are in England, who do not admire the ballot, or who do not find it convenient for their purposes, but they have never as yet been able to convert any of the States to their opinion. It was stated by Sir Robert Wilson, that Virginia had decided against the ballot. Sir Robert should have been rather surer of the foundation of his statement, before he ran up a hasty and flimsy speech upon it. Virginia did not decide against the ballot in the election of representatives, for that question was never mooted, but it decided against the representatives deciding the matters of legislation, and giving their votes secretly—a very different matter certainly.

And here, by the way, I may speak of the *inapplicability of the ballot to the business of the House of Commons*. Many persons, and even journalists, err on this point, and cannot see why, if the ballot is a good thing out of the House, it should not be a good thing in it; yet I think the reason why it would not is pretty evident. A member is not, or ought not to be sent to Parliament to exercise his own opinions, or to look after his own interests. He is the representative of the opinions, interests, and wishes of his constituents. Unless they know how he votes, they do not know whether to send him back or not, when he comes before them again to demand their suffrages. He may have been honest or dishonest, for he may have made speeches on the one side, and voted on the other. Should a bill be introduced into Parliament, which would in any way allow any honourable members to put their hands into the nation's purse, it is most likely, that as the votes could