

1685 and 1686. MARTHA TEMPLE, Ruthven's Relict, *against* LORD FORRESTER.

1685. *December 1.*—THERE is a letter from his Majesty to the Lords of Session, in favours of Martha Temple, relict of Edward Ruthven, bearing, that she had a jointure provided to her out of the lands of Corstorphine; and seeing she is a stranger, that the Lords may summarily hear and discuss her cause. Her opponent was Torwoodhead, Lord Saline's son-in-law. *Vide 25th February 1686. Vol. I. Page 380.*

1686. *February 25.*—The case of Martha Temple, relict of Edward Ruthven, mentioned 1st December 1685, claiming her jointure against Lord Forrester and the creditors, and particularly my Lord Redford, is debated; and it was contended, that the apprisings upon that estate, in the person of Hugh Wallace, were satisfied and retired, and lying in the charter-chest, and assignations taken thereto since; and that Redford had renounced by a contract, and prorogated the legal reversion of his father-in-law John Boid's comprising on that land; and the communication was only a personal obligation, and could not exclude her, who was a singular successor. *Vol. I. Page 406.*

1686. The MALTMEN of LEITH *against* The MASTERS of KING JAMES'S HOSPITAL.

*January 21.*—At Privy Council, the Maltmen of Leith and the Masters of King James's Hospital there, contending who should have the management of 2000 merks of the Maltmen's stock mortified to that Hospital, who craved it might be *primo loco* applied to the maintenance of the poor of their own trade in that Hospital; seeing, in all donations, the will of the donor is to be followed, and their own poor to be preferred:

The Privy Council referred this to the Bishop of Edinburgh, in regard it was a mortification within his own diocese, and the case had been formerly before him when he was a Privy Councillor; and he made a report that their poor should have the preference. *Vol. I. Page 397.*

*February 26.*—The Maltmen of Leith's bill, mentioned 21st January 1686, being advised; the Lords ordained their mortified money to go *primo loco* to the entertainment of their own poor in that Hospital. *Vol. I. Page 406.*

1686. *February 27.* LADY ROSS *against* YEOMAN.

THE case of Lady Ross and Yeoman being advised, the Lords find the death-bed proven; but, in regard the defender was minor, they assoilyied him from all the maills and duties uplifted, and did not draw back the effect of the reduction, neither to the citation nor to litiscontestation. *Vol. I. Page 407.*