

right; but this your 5th Resolution affords an admirable instance of what is in argument called “a non sequitur.” “Non sequitur” being a Latin phrase, “I translate it for the benefit of the country gentlemen.” It means—a conclusion not warranted by the premises. Your proposition is, that the franchise, mark me Gentlemen, “the franchise in virtue of a superiority,” and not the superiority itself, being a vested right, it is but just that when this right is taken away, the vassal should remunerate the superior; but you forgot to inform us what connection there is between the superior in his capacity of voter and the vassal, and what profit the vassal more than other people, will acquire from the franchise being taken away, that the vassal should pay the superior for the loss of his franchise. Your reason for this omission was, that if you knew any thing of the matter, you knew that there was no connexion whatever, and that the vassal will not be more benefited than other people by the franchise being taken from the superiority. I grant you, that if the right of superiority itself were to be taken away, the vassal should in equity remunerate the superior; because the vassal would then be relieved of the burden of his nominal feu duty and his casualties. But, so far as I can see, the Bill in Parliament does not take away the right of superiority. It merely takes away the Freehold Qualification which was formerly annexed to the superiority, and with which the vassal has nothing to do, leaving the vassal and his superior in the same relative situation as before.

Gentlemen, it has of late been the fashion to undervalue the Scottish paper Barons. Men had, when