No 2. selling of such furniture; and also there were divers decreets in foro contentioso betwixt these parties upon the same subjects.

Act. Nicolson & Stewart.

Alt. Aiton, Mowat & Craig.

Clerk, Gibson, Durie, p. 489.

1677. November 22.

The Fleshers of the Canongate against The Town of Edinburgh.

No 3. A burgh of barony was erected in a baron's charter, with the incorporation of feveral trades. These were found entitled to make laws for themselves, without prejudice to the baron's acts; who might appoint visitors, but could not fine.

THE town of Edinburgh did, by an act of council, appoint their cordiners and skinners, to visit the skins and hydes of beasts slain in the Canongate, or brought in to the market, and to punish those who had the same holled or tarleathered: Whereupon some of the fleshers in the Canongate were fined and imprisoned. and gave in a bill of suspension; upon which the Lords ordained the cause to be discust; and alleged, That the Canongate is a burgh of regality, erected by the King, in the Baron of Broughton's charter, whereby they have the privilege of Bailies and trades; likeas the Baron of Broughton has, by his seal of cause, produced his privilege to the fleshers of the Canongate, as a free trade and corporation, and hath given them power to make their own acts, to punish transgressors thereof, and to apply the fines to their own box and poor; and therefore the town, who have succeeded in place of the Baron of Broughton, after these privileges, cannot alter the same; and though they might appoint a Baron Bailie as the Barons did, yet they cannot appoint visitors with power to fine, especially citizens of Edinburgh, who concur with their neighbours to disquiet the trades of the Canongate, to draw the whole trade to the fleshers of Edinburgh; which is a public prejudice.

THE LORDS found the privileges granted to the suspenders valid, and that no visitors could punish their transgressions but their Baron Bailie, who might appoint visitors to sight, report, and be witnesses, but not judges; but would not limit the Bailie in his choice of those in the Canongate; and found, that the fines imposed by the Bailie, and not by the trade, by their own acts, were not comprehended in their privilege, and so belonged not to their poor.

Stair, v. 2. p. 563.

No 4.
The nature of a burgh of

1732. November 22.

Feuers of Dunse against Hay of Drummelzier.

of a burgh of barony.

A burgh of barony not a good title for acquiring a servitude of

pasturage by prescription.

The village of Dunse, belonging in property to Hume of Aiton, was, by a charter from the Crown, erected into a free burgh of barony, 'with power to the

- ' inhabitants to buy and sell, to have markets and public fairs, to have burgesses
- · who should chuse their own bailies and other officers: With power to the said burgesses and inhabitants, to have and hold the said town of Dunse, with its
- · pertinents, for ever in a true and free burgh of barony, with privileges, &c.