

There is here, Gentlemen, a very considerable bull ; but any man who is willing to know the meaning of this resolution, will easily understand it. It does not mean that 40s. ought on no account to be reduced below £20 ; but, I presume, it means that £400 ought not to be reduced below £20, and that 40s. ought not to be reduced in a less proportion. There here occurs an objection to your 3d Resolution, which I have not before stated. I am confident, Gentlemen, that there is not one among you, in the least acquainted with the comparative values of money, will assert that 40s. in 1280, about which time the old extent was ascertained, have, by any decrease in value, come in the course of four centuries to be equal to exactly £400 in 1674. And if this cannot be asserted, then it follows that there is palpable injustice in supposing that lands valued at 40s. of old extent are entitled to exactly the same political importance with lands valued at £400, under the well-known valuation ; and hence results another reason for taking the actual rental as the best criterion of the voter's qualification.

In your 5th Resolution, you have resolved, "That the franchise at present exercised in virtue of superiority is a vested right under the established laws and usage of Scotland ; and that, therefore, it is just and equitable that the holders of these superiorities should not be deprived of their right, without such equitable adjustment between them and the vassals, as to the wisdom of Parliament may seem proper."

I do not here enter into the question, whether a right surreptitiously acquired in the beginning, can, by any lapse of time acquire the title and privileges of a vested