

seals of cause, although at their date there was no fine linen wrought in Scotland.

On the 29th January 1778, "The Lords found that the silk-manufacturers were obliged to enter with the weaver craft."

*Act.* T. Morthland, W. Craig. *Alt.* D. Rae.

*Reporter,* Gardenston.

1778. *January 29.* TAILORS of GLASGOW *against* HUGH M'KECHNIE and OTHERS.

#### BURGH-ROYAL—EXCLUSIVE PRIVILEGE.

[*Fac. Coll. VIII. 405 ; Dict. App. I.—Burgh-Royal, No. III.*]

Whether the Statute 3 Geo. III, c. 8, entitles the Husband of a Soldier's Daughter to carry on Trade within Burgh, notwithstanding the Privileges of Incorporations?

KENNET. It is not so much as said that the fathers of the women whom the defenders married were tailors, or exercised any craft in Glasgow.

HAILES. The legislature had a power to limit the rights of any incorporation, company, or fraternity; and, so far as it has done, the limitation must be effectual. But I cannot perceive any words in the statute which can be interpreted in favour of the plea of the defenders; indeed it is a plea which tends to overturn all exclusive privileges of corporations.

PRESIDENT. I cannot suppose that the statute meant to give liberty of exercising trades to all the wives and children of the soldiers at large.

GARDENSTON. If a man is apt and fit to carry on a trade, his children, by the statute, may. If the husband of his daughter is apt and fit, this is sufficient.

COVINGTON. The privileges are given to wives and children, but not at large; it is only when the father has set up.

On the 29th January 1778, "The Lords found that the defenders are not exempted by the Act of Parliament;" adhering to Lord Stonefield's interlocutor.

*Act.* W. Craig. *Alt.* B. W. M'Leod.

*Diss.* Gardenston.