REDUCTION.

No. 1. 1735, Dec. 9. Maxwell of Dalswinton against Maxwell.

THE Lords found the adjudication on a charge to enter heir by itself a good title in a reduction of land rights, without proving that the person to whom he was charged to enter, was himself infeft,—and I think rightly, but I was this week in the Outer-House.

REGALIA.

No. 1. 1740, Feb. 5. THE DUKE OF ARGYLE against SIR ALEXANDER MURRAY, THE DUKE OF NORFOLK, &c.

THE Lords found that the words "other freeholders" in the act 1592, anent mines, and minerals, ought not to be restricted to freeholders holding of the Crown, but comprehends all heritors of whomsoever they hold, renit. President, Justice-Clerk, Monzie, Leven, 7th December 1739. 5th February 1740, The Lords adhered.

No. 2. 1739, June 5, 14. SIR JOHN HUME against THE ADMIRAL-DEPUTE.

THE question was, Whether whales were inter regalia or if they fell under the grant of wreck? The Ordinary found them inter regalia, and we were of the same opinion; but Arniston did not like that expression, and therefore we made our interlocutor, that whales do not fall under the gift of wreck, and therefore adhere to the Ordinary's interlocutor, which is in effect the same thing. Arniston and Royston thought they fell under wreck. They owned they had always believed they were inter regalia till this process, but now they found no sufficient foundation for that opinion, and therefore they now thought they fell under wreck. 14th, The Lords refused a reclaiming bill without answers, and adhered.

No. 3. 1750, Jan. 11. THE EARL OF HOPETON against THE OFFICERS OF STATE.

THE Earl having applied to the Crown for a seu of all mines and minerals, of gold, silver, &c. of any of his lands not contained in his former gifts, in terms of the unprinted act 1592, his petition was by the Lords of Treasury remitted to the Barons of Exchequer to report their opinion; who reported that it was lawful for his Majesty to make such a grant, and that he had always been in use to give such grants to his sub-