

III.—In summons against sundry defenders, the Lords have discharged to insert two sundry days of compearance, though never so many were called; and ordain the summons to contain only one day of compearance for all.

*Vol. I. Page 72.*

---

1680. *January 2.* Rev. MR ABERCROMBIE *against* The EARL of CASSILS.

MR Abercrombie, minister at Maybole, is imprisoned by the Lords, because he offered to take the Earl of Cassils with caption, for two years' stipend he was owing him, after he had presented a bill of suspension, and there was a verbal stop of execution. The bishops somewhat resenting this usage, he being a conformist minister, they got him set at liberty the next day.

*Vol. I. Page 72.*

---

1680. *January 6.* JAMES M'BRIDE *against* ANDREW BRYSON.

THE point betwixt James M'Bride and Andrew Bryson being reported, the Lords found the declaration under Mr Andrew Bryson's hand a writ valid and probative, and a sufficient exercise of the faculty he had reserved to himself, in his disposition to the said Andrew, of altering and annulling it; and that the said revocation needed no delivery, being in favours of his nearest heirs of line, his sisters, who were *alioqui successuræ*. Only, in respect it wanted writer's name and witnesses, they assigned to the pursuer a day to prove it to be holograph.

*Vide 6th January 1681, Hepburn.*

*Vol. I. Page 72.*

---

1680. *January 6.* The KING *against* The LAIRD of LUSS.

THE case of the Laird of Luss his ward and marriage pursued against him at the King's instance, was debated in presence of the Duke of Albany and York. Colquhoun of Luss hath lands holden ward of the King, as also other lands holden ward of the Prince: he taxes the ward and marriage of the lands holden of the King, but not those holden of the Prince. He is now pursued (beside the taxed duties,) likewise to pay L.20,000 Scots, as the avail of his marriage, for the lands holden of the Prince. He opposes his composition and change of holding, upon the faith of Act 58, Parliament 1661.

REPLIED,—That would defend him if there were a Prince extant; but, failing of him, the lands belong to the King, and so, not being taxed, the Prince is not in the case of a subject here, and therefore the marriage is due.

It seems hard, that the event of the King's not having lawful children should be calamitous, misfortunate, and prejudicial to his subjects.

The Lords having advised the debate on the 9th of January 1680, they repelled the hail defences, and found that the King had right to the avail of the marriage, both the King and Prince being here in one person. So that the King's