

not be known, this bill would pass. In open voting, those that would be benefitted by it, would not have the impudence to vote for it, or if they did, as is sometimes the case at present, they would not get another opportunity to do so, if their constituents were honest and independent. The evil effects of the ballot in an assembly of representatives, were well shewn lately in France. A law was introduced into the chamber of deputies with regard to the press, the object of which was to extend its liberties. The majority of the deputies having the fear of their constituents before their eyes, *spoke* highly in favour of the law. When, as is the practice of that assembly, the law came to the ballot, the majority of the deputies, thinking that this law would injure them, and that the liberty granted would be too great, *voted*, not according to the wish and interests of their constituents, but according to their own wishes and interests, and the law was thrown out. Wherever there is responsibility, there must be no concealment, for they are incompatible; and surely no one will say that the representative is not responsible to his constituents. Our House of Lords might use the ballot, for they are not directly responsible like the House of Commons, but public opinion does exercise even there an influence, which every well-wisher of the country would regret to see injured, as it certainly would be, by the Noble Lords giving their votes secretly.

I return again to the election of representatives, by means of the ballot. Having discussed the state of America, and the experience with regard to the ballot in it, I come now to the example of France; and I think the remarks I have previously made with regard to America, will in a great measure apply to it. There is a much

closer resemblance in the circumstances of America and France, than of either of these countries with England. France has neither a number of great capitalists, nor an aristocracy. France, too, differs from America, and more especially from England, in this, that there are no poor voters, the high qualification required to constitute a voter, excluding all those who would be likely to barter their consciences for meat, drink, or money. So far, therefore, open voting might reasonably enough be expected in France to be independent. But in France there is an influence the greater, because there is neither wealth nor a hereditary nobility to break it down or divide it, viz. the influence of the government. In England, the influence in the hands of the borough-mongers is greater than the influence of the crown, but the borough-mongers being many, and divided in their opinions, it happens that the people occasionally carry their point, but more commonly that the government, by means of large sacrifices to the borough-mongers, is able to carry their measures, whether good or bad. Unconstitutional and overwhelming as the power of the borough-mongers is, still it is better that the power should be lodged in a considerable number than in the hands of one. What this power, if united in one person, would be in England, the government was in France, and that influence, headed by the voice of the king himself, was called into the fullest operation, and would have been successful at the last election, but for this circumstance, that the deputies were elected by ballot. Who dreaded the ministers when detection was impossible! I have no hesitation in saying, that France owes her late glorious revolution to the ballot. And if any one should from this say, that the