they are yet resting owing unpaid; and such as had right by assignations, farther to depone what eases and compositions they got down. Vol. I. page 556.

1693. February 9. Mr. David Williamson and Mr. John Anderson, ministers at St. Cuthberts, against Mr. James Lows of Mercheston.

THE Lords repelled the first reason of suspension, that he was not legal minister, not having the call of the major part of the heritors, though he had the last incumbent's demission: for the Lords thought that cognition belonged to a church judicatory. And as for the 2d, that he was unequally stented, and that his quota could not be so many bolls by far, when calculated with the rest of the heritors of the parish, in regard the locality was laid on by the King and Lords of the Treasury, and ratified by a decreet of the Commission for plantation of kirks; they remitted him for his redress to that judicator by reduction, the Lords not being competent Judges of their sentences. As for the 3d, they also repelled it, viz. that they were always in use to pay only the middle fiars for their teinds, when they belonged to the bishop, and had an ease from the King when they fell to him by abolition of Episcopacy, and that past memory; and therefore they ought still only to pay him the middle fiar; for the Lords considered that it was actus meræ facultatis, and did not tie the ministers who had not such large revenues as the bishops had, and that the decreet expressly bore either delivery of the bolls, or one hundred pound for each chalder thereof. Vol. I. page 556.

1692 and 1693. John Carstairs of Kinneuchar against Sir John Ramsay of Whitehill.

1692. Dec. 22.—The Lords sustained Kilconquhair's declarator, and found it not jus tertii to him to propone; but that it was all one as if he should allege that Sir John's comprising was satisfied, paid and extinct within the years of the legal, by intromission with the means of the common debtor, which is certainly relevant; and that he might allege it, though he transacted with Sir John Ramsay, and acquired his said comprising, and had given him security for 38,000 merks for the same; seeing, when he comes to defend himself by that comprising, against other posterior creditors, they may say it is extinct by satisfaction in the person of Sir John Ramsay, your author, before he was denuded in your favours. Some of the Lords were against declaring presently, but to reserve it as a ground of recourse of warrandice against Sir John, in case Kinneuchar should afterwards be distressed, or that comprising quarrelled upon that ground.

Vol. I. page 536.

1693. Febuary 9.—The Lords found that even Carstairs had interest to propone this allegeance, that you are paid by intromission with rents of houses belonging to the common debtor; and that, when I came to use the adjudications