rest; and as for his son's disposition, it imports not, being fraudulent, after the contracting of the other creditors' debts, and containing a clause that the father might burden. It was answered, That the Act of Parliament 1621 hindered no preference of creditors, except only as to those who had done diligence; and, albeit the son's infeftment be with the father's power to burden, yet the son having become caution in contemplation of that right, he might justly have taken a disposition from his father to relieve him, even though he were insolvent; and so might justly, upon the disposition he had, prefer the creditors to whom he became cautioner; neither was his father here a notorious bankrupt, or the deed done post fugam. The Lords preferred the creditors, conform to the bond, unless it were alleged that the father had been a notorious bankrupt, or the deed post fugam; in which case, they would hear the parties thereanent.

Vol. II, Page 44.

1672. January 13. Sir James Cockburn against

Vol. II, Page 44.

1672. January 13. Burnside against Bruce.

Burnside having charged Bruce upon a bond, he suspends, and alleges Payment; and refers the same to the charger's oath: and, when he is deponing, he produces a ticket of 100 merks, and of ten dollars, in part of payment of a greater sum; yet the charger depones, That the whole sum was resting, and that this ticket was a part of another sum. The Lords rejected the quality; and found, That the deponer behoved to instruct that there was another debt resting at the time.

Vol. II, Page 45.

1672. January 24. Alexander Lorran against Henry Hume.

ALEXANDER Lorran having a gift, from the bishop of Edinburgh, to be procurator-fiscal of the commissariot of Lawder, pursues Mr Henry Hume to admit.