

ballot favours revolution, I do not deny the fact; but the ballot does not make the call for revolution until the conduct of rulers has made that revolution necessary. It makes that demand, too, without disturbance and without bloodshed. It tells quietly but decidedly, that something is wrong and must be rectified. Even without the use of the ballot, revolution will come, but being for a while kept back from a fear of failure, it does not remain with those who would have conducted it to the advantage of the whole, it spreads through the mass, the ignorant and the poor, as well as the wise, and at last men's frenzied minds urge them all at once into action, and there is fearful carnage and destruction. It was not the ballot which caused the blood to flow in the streets of Paris, for the revolution or the necessity for the king to change entirely his system, was completed when the list of deputies was known. The blood is on the head of the weak and wretched bigot, who thought that by butchering his subjects, he would produce a counter-revolution.

In concluding these remarks it is scarcely necessary for me to take notice of the system of *calling names* instead of giving arguments. Had I known nothing at all about the ballot, yet, like the cobbler of Leyden at the scholastic disputations, I would have known that Sir Robert Wilson was all in the wrong, when, at an incidental discussion on the ballot lately, in the honourable House, he got in a high passion, and called its supporters a parcel of *doctrinaires*. When Sir Robert polls Southwark at the next election (and that he will attempt, unless previously provided with a snug governorship) I suspect he will find the great majority of the electors much wiser, or much more honest, on the doctrines of the ballot than

he is, and he will be sent to the right about, unless he find it convenient, before that time, to eat both his words and his choler. And, by the way, the general will do both, and yet it will not avail him, for his empty frothiness has been tried on many occasions, and his hollow patriotism was made manifest at the famous division on the Goulburn Civil List. The day was when the name of reformer was a bye-word, and mockery in a certain honourable House. The day is coming when the *doctrinaires*, if such is to be the nickname of the supporters of the ballot, will be as much in favour in that House as reformers are now. And that day is not far distant. When the interested, the prejudiced, and the wilfully ignorant, are obliged to have recourse to the offensive arms of nicknames and ridicule, the battle is all but won. The victorious and conquering party march rapidly forward, shivering and breaking all these shafts which are sent noisy but innocuous against them.

One word, with regard to Scotland, and I have done. A paragraph has been going the round of the newspapers, in which it is stated, that the Lord Advocate throws cold water on the ballot, and that, in his opinion, there is no occasion for the ballot in this country; for that the greater morality of the people, and their superior knowledge, would prevent voting from improper motives, and the exhibition of such scenes as are witnessed at an English election. When will this infamous cant and national tomfoolery be at an end? Amongst whom should we so much expect to find morality and knowledge as amongst our civic rulers, in whose behalf we weekly supplicate grace, wisdom, and understanding? And did this Lord Advocate find, in the guzzling