confessed £1200 Scots, but adjected qualities, that he had debursed it on funerals, &c.

The Lords, at the advising his oath, finding the articles with which he charged himself most gross, exorbitant, and uninstructed, they found there was more than room for compensing and taking away the said L.100 bond; and so suspended it simpliciter.

Vol. I. Page 223.

1683. February 27. WILLIAM BAILLIE OF TORWOODHEAD against FLORENCE GARDINER.

WILLIAM Baillie of Torwoodhead reducing a comprising led by Florence Gardiner against his father; the Lords found it null, because it was led for L.50 Scots more than was due; as was proven by two of his receipts produced.

The Lords now begin to look upon comprisings as so odious, that they are but very bad and uncertain securities, if they have but the least crack or flaw in them; for, upon very minute informalities, they reduce them quoad penalties, sheriff-fees, and the expiration of the legal, and the accumulative annualrents; and only sustain them as a collateral security for principal, annualrents, and true debursed expenses: though this be done ex officio maxime nobili, like a trysting interlocutor; for, in strict law, they should either find them null or valid.

Then Torwoodhead craved he might count for the whole rent of these years whereof he uplifted a part, seeing he does not condescend on a legal impediment that debarred him from the rest.

But this cause being again heard on the 14th March 1683, in presence; the Lords sustained the comprising, because the granter of the receipts was only liferenter in the bond; though it bore a power to him to uplift it: as also found the granting of these receipts was not an entering to the possession of these lands so as to make him countable for the whole rents, but that he behoved only to count for his actual intromission. So that the Lords in effect altered and reversed their former interlocutor.

Vol. I. Page 223.

1683. March 8. Robert Burnet against Stephen Burntfield.

ROBERT Burnet, writer and commissary of Peebles, his charge against Stephen Burntfield being reported; the Lords ordained this point to be heard in presence,—If Stephen could be forced to confirm here money that was owing to a defunct Scotsman in England.

Alleged,—He should; because it was the interest and advantage of the defunct's creditors how much were here confirmed in Scotland, it making the larger subject liable to their payment. Answered,—The Commissary's jurisdiction did not extend beyond Scotland; and what locally lay in England, the Englishmen, ere they would pay it, would have it confirmed in their Prero-