

debauchee, that he or Creichie, as assignee, might pursue exhibition of his mother's contract of marriage, that he might see what was provided to the bairns or heirs of the marriage. For, though the Roman law did reprobate *pactum corvinum de hæreditate viventis* as unlawful, yet, with us, one may sell his apparency of succession even while his father or other predecessor is alive; and, though the father may disown such a flagitious son, so as to exhereditate him, (farther than to aliment him,) and may give it to another, yet the Lords thought this could not hinder him to seek exhibition of the contract.

*Vol. I. Page 602.*

1694. February 6. The COLLEGE of GLASGOW *against* JAMES WILSON and LINDSAY of MAINS.

IN the competition between the College of Glasgow, and Mr James Wilson, minister, and Lindsay of Mains, about the vacant stipend, the Lords found the Bishop's presenting, as patron, made it a patronate, but not a patrimonial mensal kirk, to fall under the exception of the Act of Parliament 1685, anent the disposal of vacant stipends to the Universities: but found the vacancy occasioned by the rabble's thrusting out ministers was *casus incogitatus*, and not foreseen or meant by the said Act of Parliament; and therefore that such vacancies did not belong to the College of Glasgow; and that Mr Wilson, proving he served at that kirk after the 13th of April 1689, (which was the date of the proclamation of the meeting of Estates,) he had right to that half year's stipend.

*Vol. I. Page 603.*

1694. February 7. STEWART *against* GORDON.

ARBRUCHEL reported the case of Stewart against Gordon, for repaying fourteen dollars he had given him in 1683, (when prisoner in the Canongate tolbooth for conventicles, and banished to Jamaica,) to help him to escape, Gordon being then one of the jailer's servants; and that, though he was once down the tolbooth stairs, yet, by his contrivance, he was retaken, and sent to America, and now returned. The libel being referred to Gordon's oath, he deponed that he got the money, but gave it to Birrel, the turnkey, and disposed of none of it; that the pursuer was indeed seized on ere he had made his full escape, but not by his means or discovery, any manner of way. The bailies had found him liable on this oath; which decret he suspended.

Some of the Lords were for finding the letters orderly proceeded, not so much on his oath, that it was an extrinsic quality that he gave away the money, and that it came not to his use, as that it was an unlawful action to take a bribe to let a prisoner escape. But the plurality found, where there was turpitude *ex parte utriusque, potior est conditio possidentis*; that the libel being only proven by his oath, you cannot divide the same, but take it complexly as it stands: