

pound rental in the burghs are equally vested in the franchise with their proprietors, it is merely the *proprietors* of such houses that are vested in the franchise in the counties. Why not extend the privilege to the tenants also? The writer of this article inhabits a house a few hundred yards beyond the boundary line of the city, as drawn at the time of the Reform Bill, for which he pays a rent of rather more than thirty pounds yearly; and there are some of his neighbours, most respectable, intelligent men, who inhabit houses for which they pay rents of forty and forty-five pounds; but, falling short of a fifty-pound rental, they do not possess a county vote. Why, we ask, should this state of things exist? As the tenants of thirty and forty pound houses, they belong to an entirely different class of persons from the tenants of thirty and forty pound farms; and the fact of actual residency in their dwellings places them in a category still more widely different from that to which the fictitious voters of our counties belong. We are disposed to hold that the exclusion of this class from the franchise is simply the consequence of a design to prevent the introduction, not of an element of subserviency, but of an element of independence, into our county elections, and that in this direction the franchise might be safely extended. It is a direction, however, in which extension could not very considerably affect the representative basis. With regard to further extension along the tenant line, our views are far from clear. It seems obvious, however, that a scale of rental common in its pecuniary amount to our cities and our smaller towns does not adequately represent classes. The ten-pound house-renters of the lesser towns are considerably superior, in the average, to the ten-pound house-renters of the larger; nay, it seems doubtful whether the five or six pound tenants of burghs containing from fifteen hundred to three thousand inhabitants do not stand, on the average, on as high a level as the