





a31188000455887b



UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

The Library

SOCSCI

DA 880.C6 M29

Marwick, James David, Sir,
1826-1908

The River Clyde and the Clyde
burghs

15

Date due

OCT 19 1976
OCT 19 1976

~~R 19 10~~

Aur

~~NOV 22 1976~~

86 11 20

86 11 07

88 11 18

88 11 09

92 12 22

92 12 08

95 12 03

95 11 23

KING PRESS NO. 303

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH
* Arts Division *

THE RIVER CLYDE
AND
THE CLYDE BURGHS.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/riverclydecldebmarw>

A
B
6193

THE RIVER CLYDE

AND

THE CLYDE BURGIIS

THE CITY OF GLASGOW

AND ITS OLD RELATIONS WITH RUTHERGLEN, RENFREW, PAISLEY,
DUMBARTON, PORT-GLASGOW, GREENOCK,
ROTHESAY, AND IRVINE

BY THE LATE

SIR JAMES D. MARWICK, LL.D.

GLASGOW

PRINTED FOR THE SCOTTISH BURGH RECORDS SOCIETY
MDCCCCIX

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

THE SCOTTISH BURGH RECORDS SOCIETY.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

LIBRARIES.

His Majesty's General Register House.
The Royal Scottish Academy.
The Royal Irish Academy, Dublin.
The Faculty of Advocates.
The Society of Antiquaries, Scotland.
The Bodleian Library, Oxford.
The Edinburgh Public Library.
The Free Reference Library, Manchester.
The Mitchell Library, Glasgow.
The Dunfermline Public Library.
The Albert Institute, Dundee.
The Society of Advocates of Aberdeen.

The Society of Solicitors in the Supreme Courts of Scotland.
The Society of Writers to His Majesty's Signet.
The University of Aberdeen.
The University Library, Cambridge.
The University of Edinburgh.
The University of Glasgow.
The University of St. Andrews.
The Baillies Institution, Glasgow.
The Royal Philosophical Society of Glasgow.
The John Rylands Library, Manchester.

BURGHS.

The Corporation of the City of London.

The Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland.

Aberdeen.
Ayr.
Dundee.
Edinburgh.

Glasgow.
Irvine.
Lanark.

Perth.
St. Andrews.
Selkirk.

- J. M. Alston, Esq., Writer, Coatbridge.
 Robert Anderson, Esq., 142 West Nile Street, Glasgow.
 E. Beveridge, Esq., St. Leonard's Hill, Dunfermline.
 Sir William Bilsland, Bart., Lord Provost of Glasgow, 28 Park Circus, Glasgow.
 Most Hon. The Marquis of Breadalbane, Taymouth Castle, Kenmore, Aberfeldy.
 J. A. Brown, Esq., 208 St. Vincent Street, Glasgow.
 Alex. Bruce, Esq., Clyne House, Sutherland Avenue, Glasgow.
 A. W. Gray Buchanan, Esq., Parkhill, Polmont, Stirlingshire.
 P. MacGregor Chalmers, Esq., I.A., Architect, 95 Bath Street, Glasgow.
 W. R. Copland, Esq., 146 West Regent Street, Glasgow.
 John M. Cowan, Esq., M.D., D.Sc., 14 Woodside Crescent, Glasgow.
 Rt. Hon. The Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, Haigh Hall, Wigan.
 John Cumming, Esq., 12 Melrose Gardens, Kelvinside, N., Glasgow.
 Ralph Dundas, Esq., C.S., c/o Richard Cameron, Bookseller, 1 St. David Street, Edinburgh.
 John Edwards, Esq., 4 Great Western Terrace, Glasgow.
 Andrew Gilmour, Esq., J.P., 212 High Street, Linlithgow.
 Robert Gourlay, Esq., 5 Marlborough Terrace, Kelvinside, Glasgow.
 Daniel Graham, Esq., 8 Royal Crescent, Glasgow.
 Sir John Macpherson Grant of Ballindalloch and Invereshie, Bart., Ballindalloch Castle, Ballindalloch.
 George Gray, jun., Esq., Town Clerk, Blairstown Park, Rutherglen.
 Rt. Hon. The Earl of Haddington, Tyningham House, Prestonkirk.
 William H. Hill, Esq., LL.D., Barlanark, Shettleston, Glasgow.
 Thomas Hunter, Esq., Town Clerk, Edinburgh.
 George Harvey Johnston, Esq., Edinburgh.
 Sir James King, Bart., LL.D., Carstairs, Lanarkshire.
 Messrs J. MacLehose & Sons, Publishers, 60 St. Vincent Street, Glasgow (3 copies).
 Rev. Wm. H. MacLeod, Manse of Buchanan, Drymen.
 Messrs Martin & Co., 27 Abingdon Street, Westminster, London, S.W.
 William Melven, Esq., 7 Jedburgh Gardens, Kelvinside, Glasgow.
 Duncan Menzies, Esq., Architect, 31 Regent Terrace, Edinburgh.
 Sir Arthur Mitchell, K.C.B., 34 Drummond Place, Edinburgh.
 Geo. Mitchell, Esq., 9 Lowther Terrace, Kelvinside, Glasgow.
 Alex. Moncrieff Mitchell, Esq., 8 Kew Terrace, Kelvinside, Glasgow.
 David Murray, Esq., LL.D., Moore Park, Cardross.
 George Neilson, Esq., LL.D., Wellfield, Partickhill Road, Glasgow.
 James Ness, Esq., LL.B., 216 West George Street, Glasgow.
 John F. Orr, Esq., 184 West Regent Street, Glasgow.
 Messrs Philip, Son & Nephew, Booksellers, South Castle Street, Liverpool.
 Rees Price, Esq., 163 Bath Street, Glasgow.
 James A. Reid, Esq., 172 St. Vincent Street, Glasgow.
 Robert Renwick, Esq., 8 Balmoral Crescent, Glasgow.
 Rt. Hon. The Lord Ruthven, Newland, Gorebridge.
 Rt. Hon. The Lord Sempill, Craigievar Castle, Leochel-Cushnie, Aberdeen.
 J. Guthrie Smith, Esq., 205 St. Vincent Street, Glasgow.
 Messrs J. Smith & Sons, Booksellers, 19 Renfield Street, Glasgow.
 J. J. Spencer, Esq., 121 West George Street, Glasgow.
 Messrs B. F. Stevens & Brown, Booksellers, 4 Trafalgar Square, London (2 copies).

William Stevenson, Esq., Hawkhead, Paisley.
Rt. Hon. The Earl of Wemyss and March, Gosford House, Aberlady.
Alexander Wood, Esq., Thornly, Saltcoats.
Messrs Wyman & Sons, Ltd., Fetter Lane, London, E.C.
T. C. Young, Esq., 13 Montgomerie Drive, Glasgow.
Wm. Young, Esq., R.S.W., 18 Wilson Street, Hillhead Glasgow.

Treasurer—

GEORGE HARVEY JOHNSTON, Esq.,
Edina Works, Easter Road, Edinburgh.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

- I.—THE ANCIENT LAWS AND CUSTOMS OF THE BURGHS OF SCOTLAND. Edited by Professor COSMO INNES.
- II.-V.—FOUR VOLUMES OF EXTRACTS FROM THE BURGH RECORDS OF EDINBURGH—(1) 1403-1528; (2) 1529-57; (3) 1557-71; and (4) 1573-89. Edited by Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D.
- VI.—INDEX TO THE FOUR EDINBURGH VOLUMES.
- VII.—CHARTERS AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE CITY OF EDINBURGH, 1143-1540. Edited by Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D.
- VIII., IX.—TWO VOLUMES OF EXTRACTS FROM THE BURGH RECORDS OF ABERDEEN—(1) 1625-42; and (2) 1643-1747. Edited by JOHN STUART, Esq., LL.D.
- X.—CHARTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM THE BURGH RECORDS OF PEEBLES, 1165-1710. Edited by WILLIAM CHAMBERS, Esq., of Glenormiston, LL.D.
- XI., XII.—EXTRACTS FROM THE RECORDS OF THE BURGH OF GLASGOW—(1) 1573-1642; and (2) 1630-62. Edited by Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D.
- XIII.—MISCELLANY OF THE SCOTTISH BURGH RECORDS SOCIETY. Edited by Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D. The Volume contains: (1) Report by Thomas Tucker to the Commissioners for Appeals as to the Trade and Shipping of Scotland in 1656; (2) Reports made to the Convention of Royal Burghs in regard to the State and Condition of the Royal Burghs in Scotland in 1692; and (3) A Collection of the Setts of the Royal Burghs made by the Convention in 1708.
- XIV., XV.—CHARTERS AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE CITY OF GLASGOW, Vol. I., Parts 1 and 2, 1175-1649. Edited by Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D.
- XVI.—EXTRACTS FROM THE RECORDS OF THE BURGH OF GLASGOW, 1663-90. Edited by Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D., and ROBERT RENWICK.
- XVII.—CHARTERS AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE CITY OF GLASGOW, Vol. II., 1649-1707, with Appendix, 1434-1648. Edited by Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D., and ROBERT RENWICK.
- XVIII.—CHARTERS AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE COLLEGIATE CHURCH AND HOSPITAL OF THE HOLY TRINITY AND THE TRINITY HOSPITAL, EDINBURGH, 1460-1661. Edited by Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D.
- XIX.—EXTRACTS FROM THE RECORDS OF THE BURGH OF GLASGOW, 1691-1717. Edited by Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D., and ROBERT RENWICK.
- XX.—THE RIVER CLYDE AND THE CLYDE BURGHS: THE CITY OF GLASGOW AND ITS OLD RELATIONS WITH RUTHergLEN, RENFREW, PAISLEY, DUMBARTON, PORT-GLASGOW, GREENOCK, ROTHESAY, AND IRVINE. By Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D.
- XXI.—EDINBURGH GUILDS AND CRAFTS: A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF BURGESS-SHIP, GUILD BROTHERHOOD, AND MEMBERSHIP OF CRAFTS IN THE CITY. By Sir J. D. MARWICK, LL.D.

P R E F A C E .

“ IN the following pages an attempt is made to present some outlines of the developments of the River Clyde. With that view observations are made on :

- I.—The establishment of the Burgh and City of Glasgow on the River, and the various chartered rights of that burgh.
- II.—The relations of Glasgow with the Burghs of Rutherglen, Dumbarton, Renfrew, Paisley, and Irvine, and their old privileges of trade.
- III.—The jealousies and conflicts to which the assertion of their rival claims and interests gave rise, and the means by which, under depressing political conditions and trading declensions, these burghs sought to maintain their antiquated commercial systems.
- IV.—The obstacles which Scotland had to encounter in developing its trade and shipping, after the liberal commercial policy of the Protectorate was superseded by the narrow hostile policy of England till the Union.
- V.—The growth of the trade of Glasgow, leading, under the condition of the channel of the Clyde as then existing, to the establishment by the city of Port-Glasgow as its port, and the position of Port-Glasgow subsequent to the withdrawal of Glasgow.
- VI.—The position of Paisley, Renfrew, and Dumbarton in relation to the navigation of the Clyde; and of Irvine as a port with which Glasgow had early commercial relations.
- VII.—The conditions under which Greenock arose and grew into a commercial port.
- VIII.—The successive steps by which the Clyde, along its whole course up to Glasgow, has, through the action of the Corporation of the city, succeeded by that of the statutory Trustees of the Clyde Navigation, been converted from a narrow, shallow river, with many natural obstructions, into a great commercial waterway, affording direct communication with the sea, and the subsequent establishment of Glasgow as a seaport.
- IX.—Some notices of the Clyde Lighthouses Trust and the Clyde Pilot Board.

The conflicting claims of Glasgow, Rutherglen, Renfrew, and Dumbarton as to their respective privileges, and specially in regard to the River Clyde, have long since been happily settled, and their ancient rivalries are well-nigh forgotten, yet the following narrative may be of interest as illustrating one form of old-world burghal rivalry.

Reference is also made to the position of subservience which Glasgow long occupied in regard to the election of its magistrates, to its struggles to obtain the freedom in that respect which Edinburgh and other royal burghs enjoyed, and to its emancipation at the time of the Revolution Settlement.

In this endeavour to present the development of the River Clyde for trading purposes its whole area from Rutherglen to the sea has been regarded as one, and the active part taken by the Clyde burghs, as these were formed and took advantage of it for trading purposes, is noticed, as far as possible, chronologically. This method involves disadvantages which would not have attended an attempt to deal with each of the burghs as a distinct and separate entity. But these disadvantages, it may be hoped, are compensated by the course which has been followed.

In extending these notices to the burgh of Irvine outside the Clyde area, regard has been had to the fact that, at an early period, before the Clyde had been made navigable for trading purposes by ships as far up as Glasgow, the then small but growing burgh drew its supplies by sea largely from that port.

In dealing with a subject so full of varied details, errors of omission and commission can scarcely be avoided. In giving the authorities for the statements made, however, those who may be interested in the subject have largely the means of detecting and correcting mistakes, and of prosecuting farther and more competent enquiry.

While I have referred, throughout the volume, to various authorities, books, and persons, from which, and from whom, I have drawn information, I must express my grateful sense of the assistance I have received from every one to whom I have found it necessary to appeal for assistance, and specially to those gentlemen whom I have named throughout the work."

The foregoing was written by Sir James Marwick, and printed in proof with a title page bearing the date 1906, while the following passages, evidently

intended to be incorporated with the Preface, were printed on a separate leaf:

"In a paper read to the International Engineering Congress at Glasgow in 1901 by Mr. W. M. Alston, Engineer-in-Chief to the Clyde Navigation Trustees, he thus describes the River Clyde—'The actual source of the river is a matter of dispute, the name 'Clyde' not applying all the way. Three head streams, under different names, claim the honour of being the continuation of the river—viz., the Clydes Burn, the Powtrail Water, and the Daer Water; but, on an inspection of the map, there can be little doubt that the true continuation is the Daer Water. This determines the main source as being on the north side of the range of hills forming the southern boundary of the County of Lanark, at an elevation of about 2,000 feet above sea level. For about 10 miles of its course the stream falls rapidly through lonely sheep-grazing country, and thereafter, with many a turn, it meanders through rich pastoral and agricultural districts until the sea is reached. At Lanark, about 53 miles from its source, the well-known falls are found in a rocky gorge about $3\frac{3}{4}$ miles in length, the total fall in that length being about 230 feet. For the remainder of the distance to Glasgow the fall is gentle, and latterly the stream traverses a portion of those rich mineral districts which have been the source of such wealth and prosperity to the West of Scotland. From its source to Port-Glasgow the river has a length of about 102 miles, and the drainage area of the river and its tributaries may be taken at about 1,400 square miles. The principal tributaries connect with the navigable portion of the river—the Kelvin joining at Glasgow, the Cart at Renfrew, and the Leven at Dumbarton.'

"A more detailed description of the Clyde as it presents itself to the eye of the artist and poet will be found in the Introduction, by Walter Chalmers Smith, D.D., LL.D., to *Twelve Drawings of the River*, by Sir George Reid, R.S.A., late President of the Royal Scottish Academy, Edinburgh, 1886.

"An admirable description of the Clyde along its whole course from Tinto to Ailsa Craig, by David Pollock, Naval Architect and Marine Surveyor, Glasgow, is given in his *Dictionary of the Clyde*, in three parts:

Part I.—The Upper Clyde: Clydesdale;

II.—The Clyde below Glasgow; and

III.—The Ayrshire Coast, from Wemyss Bay to Girvan."

To these paragraphs Sir James had appended this pencilled note relating

to a book which had been published only a few weeks before his death: "Mr. Neil Munro has recently written an interesting description of the River and Firth of Clyde, illustrated by Mary Y. and J. Young Hunter."

Preparation of the title page and other preliminaries in 1906 indicate that Sir James intended to issue the book at that time, and it is probably to the enforced relinquishment of that design that he refers when he jotted down, in pencil, on the back of a memorandum from the printer, dated 4th March, 1907, these words which, in the light of events that have come to pass, are not devoid of pathos: "During the preparation of this work I was visited by an illness which, had it occurred earlier, would have prevented my entering upon it. But having advanced so far, not only in the preparation but in the printing of the early sheets, I have been compelled to finish the work. This may explain some of the defects, of which I am fully sensible."

At one time the first half dozen sheets had received what was intended as their last revisal, but upon Sir James resuming work on the book, and learning that no part of it was actually printed off, he extended its scope so as to include the burgh of Rothesay and made other additions, necessitating the rearrangement of pages from the beginning. Of the remainder of the book he procured a proof, to the revisal of which and the supplying of additional matter the last year of his life was largely devoted. Though not fully completed in all its details the work seemed to be practically ready for publication, and it was arranged that I should see it through the press.

A posthumous publication is liable to many disadvantages, but in the present case no effort has been spared, by verifying statements and references, and by availing myself of the renewed assistance of obliging officials, to mitigate as far as possible the loss consequent on the book being deprived of the author's final revision. In one respect a departure had to be made. Sir James had contemplated the appending of notes on the early foreign trade of Scotland, the Union of the Kingdoms, and other subjects, and with these notes some progress had been made, but unfortunately they were not sufficiently advanced to be adaptable for their intended purpose and are accordingly omitted.

R. RENWICK.

GLASGOW, *March, 1909.*

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. FROM THE TWELFTH CENTURY TILL THE END OF QUEEN MARY's REIGN, - - - - -	1
II. REIGN OF KING JAMES VI. OF SCOTLAND, 1567-1603, - - - - -	27
III. JAMES VI. OF SCOTLAND AND I. OF ENGLAND, 1603-1625, - - - - -	50
IV. REIGN OF KING CHARLES I., 1625-1649, - - - - -	75
V. REIGN OF KING CHARLES II., AND PERIOD OF THE COMMONWEALTH, 1649-1660, - - - - -	92
VI. REIGN OF KING CHARLES II. SUBSEQUENT TO THE RESTORATION, 1660-1685, - - - - -	101
VII. FROM THE ACCESSION OF KING JAMES VII. TILL THE UNION, 1685-1707, - - - - -	124
VIII. FROM THE UNION TILL THE MIDDLE OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, 1707-1751, - - - - -	157
IX. FROM THE MIDDLE TILL THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, 1751-1800, - - - - -	175
X. FROM THE BEGINNING TILL THE MIDDLE OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, 1801-1850, - - - - -	191
XI. FROM THE MIDDLE TILL THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, 1851-1900, - - - - -	209
XII. OPENING YEARS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, 1901-8, - - - - -	228

APPENDIX.

	PAGE
I. TABLE SHOWING REVENUE OF THE CLYDE NAVIGATION TRUST IN EACH YEAR, FROM 1770 TO 1908, - - - - -	235
II. TABLE SHOWING REVENUE COLLECTED AT CUSTOMS, GLASGOW, AND OF SHIPS BELONGING TO GLASGOW REGISTERED FROM 1796 TO 1908, - - - - -	237
III. TABLE SHOWING NUMBER AND TONNAGE OF SHIPS ARRIVING AT THE HARBOUR OF GLASGOW FROM 1828 TO 1908, - - - - -	239
INDEX, - - - - -	241

I.

FROM THE TWELFTH CENTURY TILL THE END OF QUEEN MARY'S REIGN.

IN the last quarter of the twelfth century, between 1175 and 1178, King William the Lion granted to God and St. Kentigern, and Joceline, bishop of Glasgow, and his successors, a charter by which he empowered the bishops to have a burgh at Glasgow, with a market on Thursday, well and honourably, quietly and fully, with all the freedoms and customs which any of his burghs enjoyed. To all the burgesses who might reside in the burgh thus created, he granted his firm peace in going and returning through his whole land; and he prohibited every one from troubling and molesting them or their goods or from inflicting any injury upon them, under pain of his full forfeiture.¹

On some date between the years 1189 and 1198, William granted another charter, by which he empowered the burgesses to hold a fair at Glasgow, yearly, for eight days from the octaves of the apostles Peter and Paul—*i.e.*, from 6th July—with his firm and full peace, and with all the liberties and rights granted or belonging to any fairs in Scotland.² And still later, on 27th June, in some year before 1211, he renewed the grant of his firm peace to all who should attend the fair, while repairing to or returning from it, and while actually there.³

¹ Glasgow Charters (Charters and documents relating to the City of Glasgow—Scottish Burgh Records Society), vol. I., part ii., p. 3, No. 1.

In an action of declarator by Glasgow against Dunbarton, decided by the Court of Session in favour of Glasgow on 8th February, 1666, it was pleaded that, as a necessary and essential point of the freedoms conferred by this charter, the burgh had the right and privilege of merchandising, sailing out and in with ships, barks, boats, and other vessels upon the Clyde, and arriving, loading, and unloading goods at places convenient within the river. *Ibid.*, vol. II., No. 136, p. 61.

² *Ibid.*, p. 6, No. 3. This is the well-known Glasgow fair which is still held yearly. Its date continued as originally fixed till the year 1744 when, to prevent the inconvenience of “the Sabbath intervening in these eight days,” the town council ordained that the fair should begin on the first Monday of July and continue only till the end of the week. The reckoning was then old style, and the first Monday O.S. gradually dropped into the second Monday N.S., which for a long time past has been accepted as the beginning of the fair (See Renwick's Glasgow Memorials, p. 206).

³ Glasgow Charters, vol. I., part ii., p. 7, No. 4.

These were the chartered rights of the burgh and burgesses of Glasgow when, on the 8th of July, in the eighth year of the reign of King Alexander II. (c. 1221)—somewhere about forty-seven or forty-eight years after Glasgow had been constituted a bishop's burgh—that King granted a charter by which he created a burgh at his new castle of Dumbarton, and conferred upon it and his burgesses remaining in it all the liberties and free customs which his burgesses of Edinburgh possessed. He granted to it also a weekly market on Wednesday; to its burgesses exemption from tolls throughout the country; and his peace to all who brought merchandise to the burgh.¹ In 1223, again, he granted to the burgesses two parts of the lands of Morvach (Murroch) for the common good,² and two years later a third charter, empowering them to hold an annual fair on the Feast of the Nativity of John the Baptist (24th June), to last for eight days, with all the privileges usually attached to such fairs.³

Such was the position of the two burghs of Glasgow and Dumbarton, on the river Clyde, in the first quarter of the thirteenth century—both burghs created by the Sovereign, and both enjoying, by virtue of royal grants, all the freedoms and customs which the most favoured royal burghs possessed. The burgh of Glasgow, created at least forty years before that of Dumbarton, held, however, of the bishop, and was subject to him; the burgh of Dumbarton, held directly of the Sovereign, and both were hedged around with all the protection which the royal power at that early period could give.⁴

¹ Irving's History of Dumbartonshire, pp. 45, 46.

² *Ibid.*, p. 46. Glasgow Charters, II., No. 137, p. 113.

³ Irving, p. 46. King Alexander granted to the monks of Newbottle a toft within his burgh of Dumbarton and the fishing of a net on the river Leven (*Registrum de Newbottle*, No. 179). Dumbarton also received charters from King Alexander III. and King David II., both of which were confirmed by the crown charter to the burgh in 1609 to be afterwards referred to.

Thomas Pennant, writing about 1772, says—"The Roman fleet in all probability had its station under Dumbarton; the Glotta, or Clyde, had then sufficient depth of water; the place was convenient and secure near the end of the wall and covered by the fort of Dunglas."

In his later years King Robert the Bruce spent much of his time at Cardross, a manor on the Clyde, and occupied himself largely in shipbuilding. He had what is referred to in the Exchequer Rolls as "his great ship," for which, probably, a harbour at Cardross was constructed. The size of the ship may be indicated by the fact of its being hauled from the shore to the river adjoining the manor of Cardross. In 1329 the ship had to be brought from Tarbert to Cardross, and twelve men of Dumbarton were employed to bring it at a cost of 18s. (Exchequer Rolls, I., p. 127). The king died on 7th June, 1329, but the great ship appears in the accounts for some time afterwards. Dumbarton was at this time a place from which seamen could be drawn. In the accounts for 1332 it is stated that five were taken from it to Dundee (*Ibid.*, I., p. 415). Ships of James IV. were built there, and after his death at Flodden, in 1513, a part of his navy was placed there.

⁴ Glasgow pleaded, in 1666, that it was acknowledged and reputed a free royal burgh long before Dumbarton had any foundation, erection, or being, by the public acts and records of the land, of parliament, conventions of estates, conventions of burghs, acts of the councils of the kings of Scotland, and of all public judicatories of the same, and was therefore

But there were, on the south bank of the Clyde, two other burghs of older date than either Glasgow or Dumbarton. These were Rutherglen and Renfrew.

Rutherglen, about two miles above Glasgow, claims to have received from King David I. the privileges of a free burgh (*circa* 1126).¹ A charter granted by King William the Lion confirmed to it as "his burgh, and his burgesses of the same," all the customs and rights which they had in the time of King David.² Then, on 20th April, 1324, a charter by King Robert I. recited that of King William, and confirmed the customs and rights enjoyed by the burgh in David's time, and specified the boundaries which had been assigned to it in his charter.³ Various other grants were made to the burgh by different kings, and especially a feu right granted by King Robert II. on 6th February, 1387-8, in favour of his faithful burgesses and community of the burgh, with the power of holding courts, and with the mills, fishings, and former customs, to be held feu for payment of a feu-duty of £13 sterling yearly.⁴

Renfrew, situated about six miles below Glasgow, is supposed to have been a royal burgh in the reign of King David I., and he made a grant to the Abbey of Holyrood of a toft in it, with the draught of one net for salmon, and to fish there for herrings freely.⁵ He also granted to the monks of Kelso a toft or piece of ground at Renfrew, and the right of trading with one ship; also, one net's fishing

allowed place and precedence to ride, sit, and vote in parliament, and in all public and national meetings, long before the burgh and town of Dumbarton, in so far as that the burghs and towns of Ayr, Irvine, Renfrew, Dumfries, and several others, to the number of twenty-six or thereby, gave place to Glasgow, and are ranked and ordered after it and prior to Dumbarton. Glasgow Charters, vol. II., No. 136, p. 61.

¹ Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, VII., pp. 239-40.

² *Ibid.*, I., p. 76.

The jurisdiction of Rutherglen appears to have extended to the north side of the Clyde, and so led to claims by that burgh upon Glasgow which caused the intervention of Alexander II., who, by charter dated 29th October, 1226, prohibited Rutherglen from taking toll or custom within Glasgow, but allowed it to take them at the Cross of Schedenston as of old (Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 12, No. 8). This prohibition was made applicable to the barony of Glasgow by Letters addressed by James II. to the communities of Renfrew and Rutherglen, dated 4th February, 1449-50 (*Ibid.*, p. 28, No. 20).

³ Robertson's Index of Charters, p. 23, No. 9. Hamilton's Sheriffdom of Lanark and Renfrew, pp. 224 5.

Rutherglen, says Professor Cosmo Innes, was not always so insignificant as it is now. Its ferme or rent paid to the crown was considerable. After some pretty large assignations made from it by successive kings for various purposes in the cathedral of Glasgow, the burgh still paid of ferme to the crown in 1331, £15, while Linlithgow paid £10, Edinburgh £32, and Berwick £46. (Scotland in the Middle Ages, p. 161.)

⁴ Robertson's Index of Charters, p. 132, No. 6. Great Seal Register, vol. I., p. 171, No. 6; p. 173, No. 17. Hamilton's Lanark and Renfrew, p. 228. Ure's History of Rutherglen (1793), pp. 5, 6. Chalmers' Caledonia, III., p. 801. Municipal Corporation Reports (1835), II., p. 371. Appendix to General Report, p. 9.

⁵ Holyrood Charters, p. 5. Register of the Great Seal, I., p. 185.

at the same place, free from all exaction.¹ He subsequently granted Renfrew and the adjoining lands to Walter, the son of Allan, the first Steward.² It then became the head burgh of the barony of that name, the ancient patrimony of the Stewards of Scotland. Walter also granted to the monks of Kelso additional lands at Renfrew;³ to the monks whom he planted at Paisley a tenement in the burgh of Renfrew, one net's fishing for salmon, and six nets' and one boat's fishing for herring.⁴ He also granted to the monks of Paisley the island in the Clyde near the burgh of Renfrew, with the fishing between that island and Perthie, a full toft in the same burgh, half a merk of silver yearly from the ferme of the burgh, a net for salmon, and the mill of Renfrew.⁵ He also granted to the monks of Dunfermline one full toft in the burgh of Renfrew.⁶ In the charters of Walter he calls Renfrew *burgo meo*, and it is so called in the charters of his successors. The same policy, says Chalmers, was continued by Allan, the son and successor of Walter. He granted to the monks of Cambuskenneth a full toft in his burgh of Renfrew and a net's fishing in the Clyde, and also to the monks of Cupar a toft in his burgh and a net's salmon fishing in the Clyde.⁷

After the accession of the Stewarts to the Scottish crown, Renfrew was erected by Robert III. into a royal burgh on 10th November, 1397, and, in course of time became the head burgh of the shire, as it had previously been of the barony of Renfrew. This charter is granted to the burgesses and community, and conveyed in feu ferm the burgh itself, with its fishings in the Clyde, and the burgh fermes, small customs, and tolls, as well within the burgh as through the whole barony of Renfrew. It declared that no markets should be held in the barony except within the burgh, and that the burgesses should be as free of tolls and small customs as any other burgesses of Scotland. Right was also given to hold courts, and to the issues and profits thereof, excepting of life and limb. Generally, all other rights and privileges were granted as fully as were enjoyed in other burghs. The yearly fermes consisted of eight merks payable to the king, and one hundred shillings to support a chaplain in the parish church.⁸ The burgh and district gave the title of baron of Renfrew to the heir-apparent of the Scottish throne, and its connection with the ancient Stuart line is still preserved by the retention of the title by the Prince of Wales.

¹ Liber de Calchou, No. 2, p. 6.

² Registrum de Passelet, Appendix No. 1. Paisley Charters (Metcalfe), p. 5. New Statistical Account of Scotland, VII., p. 16.

³ Liber de Calchou, No. 170, p. 138.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁴ Registrum de Passelet, p. 2.

⁶ Registrum de Dunfermlyn, No. 162, p. 93.

⁷ Registrum de Cambuskenneth, p. 48; Chalmers' Caledonia, III., 801-2.

⁸ Great Seal Register, III., p. 626, No. 2705. Municipal Corporation Reports, II., p. 355. Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, V., pp. 456, 574-5, 719. Hamilton's Lanark and Renfrew, p. 281. New Statistical Account of Scotland, VII., p. 16.

What were the liberties and privileges of Royal Burghs in the thirteenth century can only be indicated here. They are stated in the *Leges Burgorum* ("The Burgh Laws of Scotland"), which is the earliest collected body of the laws of Scotland of which there is any mention.¹ This code, with the exception of some manifest additions, was sanctioned by the legislature in the reign of King David I. (1124-1153). Applied first to the four southern burghs of Edinburgh, Roxburgh, Berwick, and Stirling, it soon became the law of all the burghs of Scotland.² It defined the duties and obligations of burgesses and merchants respectively; required foreign merchants to buy wool, hides, and other merchandise

¹ Almost as old as the original constitution of burghs in Scotland, a court, known as the Court of the Four Burghs of Edinburgh, Stirling, Berwick, and Roxburgh, existed, and was presided over by the Great Chamberlain of Scotland. From it the code referred to in the text appears to have emanated. When Berwick and Roxburgh fell into the hands of the English, Lanark and Linlithgow were appointed, in 1368, by an act of King David II., to take the place of these two burghs. But in 1405, in the reign of King Robert III., the burghs, by an act or ordinance passed by them in Stirling, appointed two or three burgesses of each of the burghs south of the Spey to convene annually, "to treat, ordain and determine upon all things concerning the utility of the common weal of all the King's burghs, their liberties and courts" (Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, I., 339). Its meetings in Edinburgh were authorised by King James I. and King James II.; and in 1487 King James III. ordered commissioners of all burghs, both south and north, to convene annually in Inverkeithing, under a penalty of £5, to commune and treat upon the welfare of merchandise, the good rule and statutes for the common benefit of burghs, and to provide for remeid on the skaith and injury sustained within burghs (1487, c. 17, Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, II., 179). Notwithstanding this enactment, however, the burghs continued to meet in Edinburgh, and even so late as 1500 retained the designation of "The Parliament of the Four Burghs," and were presided over by the Lord Chamberlain. How long that officer attended these assemblies or they retained that title does not appear, but a minute in 1529 and all the subsequent minutes of the body refer to the acts set forth in them as passed by the commissioners of the burghs alone.

² Although David has been usually called the creator of the privileges of the Scotch burghs, it is impossible, says Professor Innes, to consider this code as arising from a single act of legislative policy. It evidently contains the result of much experience of the objects and the difficulties of burghal administration. (Pref. to the Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, vol. I., p. 33.)

Among the marks of rapid improvement and civilization which distinguished the reign of David I. the most important was the recognition of the privileges of the Free Burghs. There can be no doubt that communities existed in the towns of Scotland, supported by mutual confederation, at a much earlier period; and indeed, here, as in other countries, a part of our burghal institutions can be traced up, with much probability, through the free towns of the Continent to the *Municipia*, which survived the downfall of the Empire. But it was under this wise prince that the burghs of Scotland took their place as recognised members of the body politic of a feudal kingdom. Their voluntary incorporation was legalised. They became tenants *in capite* of the crown, and from that period yielded a large proportion of the revenue of the country, whether as rent of the tenements within burghs, or as custom levied on their merchandise. (*Ibid.*, vol. I., pp. 6, 7.)

only from burgesses, and within burghs;¹ gave burgesses the exclusive right to buy wool to dye, and to make and cut cloth;² prescribed the mode in which the aldermen and bailies of the burghs were to be annually elected by the “good men of the town”;³ prohibited forestallers, and prescribed their punishment;⁴ required fish brought to the burgh for sale to be sold only in the public market, and not to be taken to any house;⁵ prescribed the peace and privileges of fairs;⁶ and excluded dyers, fleshers, and shoemakers from the freedom of the guild, unless they swore not to exercise their craft with their own hands, and only by their servants.⁷ In the *Fragmenta Collecta* it is stated that King David also ordained that all burgesses should be free throughout his kingdom, as well by water as by land, to buy and sell for their own profit, without any disturbance, under pain of full forfeiture.⁸ The *assize* of King William, whose reign extended from 1165 to 1214, prescribed the liberty of the merchant guild and gave its members authority to buy and sell within the liberties of burghs, but prohibited every one from occupying the liberty of another;⁹ required all wool, skins, hides, or such like merchandise to be sold only to the merchants of burghs, within whose sheriffdom and liberty the owners of the merchandise dwelt, and commanded such merchandise to be presented at the market cross of burghs;¹⁰ required foreign merchants to sell merchandise only in burghs, and chiefly to merchants, and from ships belonging to merchants; and prohibited them from selling cloth otherwise than in wholesale, and only in burghs, and to the merchants of these burghs.¹¹

These were the privileges which belonged to royal burghs at this early period,¹² but though Glasgow was then, and long afterwards, only a bishop's burgh

¹ Ancient Laws and Customs of Scotland (Burgh Records Society), No. 16, p. 9.

⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 94, p. 46.

² *Ibid.*, No. 22, p. 11.

⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 29, p. 175.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 70, p. 34.

⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 39, p. 60.

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 66, p. 32; No. 72, p. 35.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 40, p. 61.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 73, p. 36.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, No. 41, p. 61.

⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 86-7, pp. 41-2.

¹² Trade in Scotland did not, however, commence with the foundation of burghs. Though King David I. gave system and security to such commerce as then existed by consolidating burghal institutions, the *Leges Quatuor Burgorum*, so far as they were received from him, were largely declarations of customs and observances previously existing, with possible modifications. The northern burghs of Scotland had their “Hanse” in the time of William the Lion, who confirmed it between 1165 and 1214, and granted privileges to burghs, “*sicut consuetudo et assisa fuit tempore Regis David avi mei*”—not as he made the law, but as he found it.

The *Assiza de Tolioneis* and the chapters *de Custuma Portuum* in the acts of parliament (vol. I.) doubtless indicate the goods imported into Scotland at and previous to the time of King David I.

In his Preface to the *Ledger of Andrew Halyburton* (1867) Professor Innes refers to the trade of Scotland in the reign of David I. (1124-1153), and adds, “In the reign of Edgar (1097-1106 7), in David's own reign, and much more in the time of his grandsons, Malcolm (1153-1165) and William (1165-1214), and of the two Alexanders, II. (1214-1249) and III.

of barony, King William, in so erecting it, conferred upon it "all the freedoms and customs which any of his burghs enjoyed."

The burgh of Irvine¹ is said to have received a charter from King Alexander II., which was confirmed by King Robert the Bruce by a charter of date 12th May, 1322. The latter charter freed and relieved the burgesses from all toll and custom on their goods throughout his whole kingdom, and declared that thenceforth they should be altogether quit and for ever free from the toll they had been wont to pay in his burgh of Ayr.² On 8th April, 1372, King Robert II. granted a charter to settle questions between Ayr and Irvine as to their respective rights of traffic and merchandise between the baronies of Cunningham and Irvine, and by it he erected Irvine a royal burgh, bestowing upon it and its burgesses all the liberties and privileges enjoyed by any royal burgh in the kingdom with the freedom of a guild.³ This was followed, on 14th February, 1372-3, by a Precept or Letter of Protection by King Robert II., commanding all and sundry to respect and preserve the liberties and privileges which had been recognised as belonging to "our burgh of Irvine" by his charter of 1372.⁴

Stung by the treatment of Edward I., Scotland, in 1295, during the reign of John Balliol, formed a defensive alliance with France against England. There had been previous understandings between the French and Scottish Kings, but it was this treaty which established the tradition of a Scoto-French alliance. Though the immediate consequences of the league were, as Professor Hume Brown says, sufficiently disastrous, it led to the development of the trading relations of the two countries. Scottish vessels carried to the ports of France smoked and dried or salted fish and skins, and brought back wines and other luxuries.⁵ In this trade the Clyde participated.

(1249-1286), the customs of foreign merchandise arriving at the ports of Scotland were a reliable source of the royal revenue, and often formed the fund from which the sovereign endowed his religious foundations, as well as a fund of credit for national loans" (Halyburton's Ledger, p. xlvi.). Upon the subject of early Scottish merchandise see Professor Innes' *Scotland in the Middle Ages* (pp. 236-250).

¹ Irvine, though on the Ayrshire coast, and about thirty miles by road and fifty-eight miles by sea from Glasgow, is here included by reason of its harbour having, in early times, been used by the citizens of Glasgow as its port. Goods disembarked there were carried to the city on pack horses.

² Muniments of the Burgh of Irvine (Ayrshire and Galloway Archaeological Association), I., pp. 9, 10. On 22nd October, 1386, King Robert II. granted to the burgesses and community a piece of ground on which to build a council house (*Ibid.*, pp. 15, 16). On 2nd January, 1390-1, King Robert III. granted two charters, one confirming the charter of 1372 and the other the Letters of Protection of the same year (*Ibid.*, p. 17); and by a charter not dated King James I. renewed to the burgh the charter of 1390-1 (*Ibid.*, p. 22).

³ Regist. Mag. Sig., I., No. 302, p. 86. Muniments of the Burgh of Irvine (Ayrshire and Galloway Archaeological Association), vol. I., pp. 11-15. Municipal Corporation Reports, II., 127.

⁴ Mun. of Irvine, I., 13-15.

⁵ Hume Brown's *History of Scotland*, I., p. 142.

On 28th March, 1364, King David II. granted a charter under his great seal by which he conferred on his burgesses throughout Scotland free liberty to buy and sell within the liberty of their own burgh, expressly discharging any of them to buy or sell within the bounds or liberties of any other without license obtained to that effect. He also forbade bishops, priors, or kirkmen, earls, barons, or others of the temporal estate from buying wool, skins, hides, or other kinds of merchandice under any pretext or colour. He also forbade expressly all estates whatsoever from selling anything save to the merchants of the burgh within whose liberty they resided; and he commanded and charged them to present all kind of merchandice at the market place and cross of the burghs, that merchants might buy there; and ordered that the said merchandice should be produced and offered without fraud or gyle, and the king's custom paid upon it. He forbade also all outlands merchants or strangers who came with their ships or merchandice from selling any kind of merchandice save to the burgesses of his burghs, and prohibited them from buying any kind of merchandice save from merchants of his burghs under pain of his highness' unlaw. These liberties, privileges, and constitutions he ordained to have full strength and force through all future ages.¹

It is not necessary to refer in detail here to the relative rights and privileges of merchant burgesses as distinguished from those of the craftsmen class. In some burghs the merchants were associated in guilds. In others, as in Glasgow till a late period, they were not so organised. At the earliest period of record, however, admission as a burgess carried with it privileges common to both merchants and craftsmen. But the merchant class, possibly by reason of their larger means and social position, ultimately secured an influence greater than that of the craftsmen, and assumed practically the management of the affairs of the burghs. Then—as the governing body—the magistrates, on the application of the various classes of craftsmen, granted to them what were known as seals of cause, defining their constitution and functions, and constituting each a corporation, with power to elect its own deacon or president and other officers, and to administer its own funds and affairs. These craft corporations, again, associated themselves under one head, and, so confederated and strengthened, obtained a small share in the management of the burgh, and collectively were able in process of time to restore free burghal administration. In the same way, and from the same source, the Merchants' House of Glasgow derived its constitution and functions, and, like some of the crafts guilds, had these ratified by Parliament.

The divergent interests of the merchant and craft burgesses of each burghal community do not, however, emerge in the questions between the burghs referred to in this work. In the relations of each burgh with its neighbour both

¹ Convention Records, I., p. 541. A judicial transcript of this charter, made on 24th May, 1605, is preserved in the Archives of the City of Edinburgh. Convention Records, I., pp. 538-540.

sections of burgesses had interests common to the burgh with which they were connected, and so, in their external relations, made common cause. Intramural discord did not prevent or interfere with the exercise by each royal burgh, or burgh entitled by its charters to the privileges of a royal burgh, of freedom of trade. That freedom, however, came to be often illegally used by burghs of barony and regality, frequently under coverture of arrangements with burgesses of royal and privileged burghs, which formed the subject of incessant complaints, and are noticed in the records both of individual royal and free burghs and of the Convention of Burghs. To the quarrels and complaints so arising reference must be made, as leading up to the introduction of a sounder policy, under which these restrictions, hostile to commercial developments, were modified, and finally removed. It has to be observed, however, in explanation of the special privileges which royal and free burghs possessed in early times, that they were liable to financial burdens and responsibilities from which other burghs were exempt. It was nevertheless complained by the royal and free burghs that grants were not unfrequently made by the Crown of various burghal privileges to burghs holding of private superiors, in barony or regality, though they were not subjected to burdens which royal and free burghs had to bear.

In virtue of its creation as a royal burgh and its situation lower down the Clyde than that of Glasgow, the magistrates of Dumbarton claimed a right to exact taxes from the burgesses and men of the bishop's burgh as a condition of their being permitted to trade to or past Dumbarton by the river, or through the burgh to the West Highlands. This claim was resisted by Glasgow, and chronic strife between the two burghs prevailed. Before the dispute called for the intervention of the Sovereign, however, Alexander II. granted three charters to Bishop Walter—one confirming the right to have a burgh in Glasgow, with a market on Thursdays and all the liberties and customs of the King's burghs; another confirming the right to have an annual fair in the burgh; and the third reconfirming the right to have a burgh and market in Glasgow. The first two of these charters were dated on 23rd July, 1224-7, and the third on 22nd November, 1225.¹

On 13th October, 1235, King Alexander granted a charter to Bishop William, exempting him and his successors, and their men, natives, and servants, from payment of toll throughout his whole kingdom, as well within as without burghs, for their own goods, and for all other things which they bought for their own use; and he prohibited every one from exacting toll from them or causing them annoyance.² Seven years later, again, on 11th January, 1242-3, he granted a charter to Bishop William, by which—obviously having reference to the claims of Dumbarton—he confirmed to the bishop and his successors that their burgesses and men of Glasgow might go in Argyle and Lennox, and throughout his whole kingdom, to buy and sell, and to exercise every sort of merchandise when they

¹ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., Nos. 5, 6, and 7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 13, No. 9.

will, freely, without any let or hindrance by the bailies of Dumbarton, or by any other bailies, as the burgesses and men of Glasgow of old could do before he founded the burgh of Dumbarton. It also confirmed to all coming to the fair and market of Glasgow, and thence returning, his firm peace and protection.¹

Notwithstanding these charters, the burgesses and men of Glasgow seem to have been subjected to some trouble, for, on 30th April, 1251, King Alexander III., who had succeeded his father on 8th July, 1249, granted letters to Bishop William setting forth that he had taken the bishop, his lands and men and all their possessions, under his firm peace and protection, and prohibiting, under pain of his full forfeiture, all injury or molestation to them.² Even that seems to have been ineffectual, for, twenty-four years later, the same King, on 18th June, 1275, granted another charter intimating to the sheriff, bailies, and provosts of Dumbarton that "they knew well how his Majesty had granted to the bishop that his men might go to and return from Argyle with their merchandise freely and without any impediment." Moreover, in respect that this liberty was granted to the bishop before the burgh of Dumbarton was founded, the King commanded those to whom the order was addressed that, if they had taken anything from the bishop and his men, restitution should be made without delay, and that farther vexation and trouble should cease.³ This command, however, like those which had preceded, seems to have failed in effecting its purpose.

On 26th April, 1309, King Robert I. granted a charter to Bishop Robert Wischard—whose sufferings in the cause of the King and the independence of Scotland are gratefully referred to—by which he charged all his justiciars, sheriffs, provosts, and bailies to cause the bishop's churches, lands, possessions, and all his goods, hitherto seized by them or others whomsoever, within their bailiaries, to be delivered over to persons named on behalf of the bishop.⁴ Fifteen years later King Robert I. granted a charter, dated 28th July, 1324, by which he ratified the charter of Alexander II., dated 22nd November, 1225, and all the powers therein expressed, as contained in the charter by William the Lion to Bishop Joceline.⁵ Again, on 15th November, 1328, he ratified the charter by King Alexander III., dated 18th June, 1275, to which reference has been made.⁶ On 14th October, 1397, King Robert III. issued a precept under his privy seal for the granting of a charter under the great seal to the burgesses and community of Glasgow to hold their weekly market on Monday instead of Sunday.⁷

¹ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 14, No. 10.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 24, No. 18.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16, No. 11.

It does not appear when, or by what authority, the change of market from Thursday to Sunday had been effected.

³ *Ibid.*, I., ii., p. 17, No. 12.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21, No. 15.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 23, No. 16.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 24, No. 17.

The town of Rothesay was erected into a royal burgh by King Robert III. His charter, dated at his castle of Rothesay, 12th January, 1400, granted and for ever confirmed to his men of Rothesay that they and their successors thenceforward should be his free burgesses, holding and possessing the town as a free royal burgh by all its just ancient and allotted bounds, with all the privileges, liberties, and just pertinents belonging or appertaining to a free royal burgh. By this charter he declared that no merchant stranger or other person whatsoever should buy or sell, make or make use of anything for sale contrary to the liberties of the burgh, within its ancient estates and boundaries, under the penalties prescribed by law.¹

In the first half of the fifteenth century Irvine claimed a right to appear at Ayr upon its market day, and there, standing in the market, to sell broad and narrow cloth, wax, wine and iron, tar and lint, cloth and all other small goods and merchandice. This claim was resisted by Ayr, and an appeal was made to the Convention of Burghs, who, on 7th February, 1443, remitted to a committee to hear parties and decide the question at issue. Under that remit the committee heard the representatives of Ayr and Irvine, and decided that the merchants neither of Irvine or of any other town ought to come within the town of Ayr either on the market day or any other day of the week to sell goods of merchandice belonging to the guild or to buy wool, hides or skins, or other goods belonging to the guild, save only on the fair day and during its continuance, after old privileges. This decree was confirmed by King James II., on the same day, under the Great Seal. But as he was then in minority he granted a new confirmation on 27th May, 1458.²

Referring apparently to a statement by John M'Ure regarding the trade of Glasgow as existing in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, John Gibson, merchant, whose history was published in 1777, says—"A Mr. William Elphinston is mentioned as the first promoter of trade in Glasgow, as early as the year 1420; the trade which he promoted was, in all probability, the curing and exporting of salmon."³

¹ Municipal Corporation Scotland Commissioners Reports, II., p. 365.

The Isle of Bute in the Olden Time (by James King Hewison), II., p. 100.

Reid's History of Bute, Appendix, p. 257.

² Muniments of the Burgh of Ayr, (Ayr and Wigton Archaeological Association), pp. 27-29.

³ Gibson's History of Glasgow, p. 203. M'Ure's History of Glasgow (1830 edition), p. 93.

During the reign of James I. John Harding visited Glasgow, and described it as a "goodly cyte and univercite, where plentiful is the countre, also, replenished well with all comoditee" (Hume Brown's Early Travellers in Scotland, p. 23).

The practice of merchandise in early times was hampered by various restrictions. Thus in 1424 it was enacted that no merchant could pass over the sea unless he satisfied an inquest that he had three serplairs (a serplaith = 80 stones) of wool in merchandise or of the same value (1424, c. 16, Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, II., 8); and in the following year

To provide the means of amicably settling such questions as arose from time to time between the burghs on the Clyde, Renfrew and Dumbarton found it desirable, in 1424, to enter into an arrangement. On 29th August of that year twelve burgesses of each burgh met in Dumbarton and entered into an Indenture, by which they agreed that all questions and disputes which might arise between them should be amicably determined by six men chosen by each burgh, and by an oversman to be appointed alternately by each burgh. It was also agreed that the freedoms of each burgh should be duly observed, and that no burgess of either burgh should forestall or buy within the freedom of the other without leave purchased, but that each burgh should intercommune with the other in good neighbourhood.¹ The arrangement thus come to, however, does not seem to have remained effectual for any length of time. In or previous to 1429 the Great Chamberlain of Scotland² was called upon to interfere between them. A decree pronounced by him on 3rd January, 1429, sets forth that, disputes having arisen between the two burghs as to "certane fredomes and fyschingis," King James I. had commanded the chamberlain to take action in the matter. Both burghs had, in consequence, been summoned to appear before him, and submit to an assize

that enactment was supplemented by the provision that all merchants passing over the sea in merchandise should bring home harness, armour, spear shafts, and bowstaves (1425, c. 2, *Ibid.*, II., 9). The withdrawal by merchants from the country of gold and silver and their failure to bring bullion home were also prohibited and punished (1487, c. 11, *Ibid.*, II., 182).

The trade between Scotland and Flanders, says Professor Innes, was of immemorial antiquity, but in the beginning of the fifteenth century Bruges was the recognised staple of the Scotch trade in the Netherlands. In 1444 the marriage of Mary of Scotland to the Lord of Campvere led to the staple being transferred to Campvere, where it remained till 1539, when it was removed to Antwerp, and two years afterwards to Middleburgh. But it soon returned to Campvere, where it remained, with short interruptions, till the French Revolution (Preface to the *Ledger of Halyburton*, pp. liv., lv.)

Writing of the exports of Scotland to Flanders in 1437, Hakluyt says "of Scotland the commodities are felles, hides, and of wool the fleese;" and of its imports "little mercerie,

And great plentie of haberdashers ware,
And halfe her ships with cart wheeles bare,
And with barrows are laden as in substance,
Thus most rude ware are in her chevesance."

(The Principal Navigations, &c. (MacLehose edition), II., 121).

¹ Gibson's History of Glasgow, p. 203. Irving's Dumbartonshire (1800), Appendix, pp. 572-3. Hamilton's Lanark and Renfrew, p. 282.

² The Great Chamberlain, as the name implies, had probably the general control of the Treasury; but his functions, both administrative and judicial, had more particular reference to the affairs of the burghs (Mr. Cosmo Innes's Preface to Vol. I. of the Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, p. 5). The nature of the supervision which he exercised over the burghs is indicated in the "Articuli inquirendi in Burgo in itinere camerarii secundum vsum Scocie," a document supposed to be of the latter half of the reign of King Robert I. (1306-1329), and in the "Modus procedendi in itinere camerarii infra regnum Scocie"—apparently of the end of the fourteenth century (Acts of Parliament, I., 316 and 329; Mr. Innes's Preface, pp. 44-5).

their respective rights and claims. This they did at Glasgow on 22nd November, when the assize found that Renfrew was in possession of the fishing of the "schottis, called the Sand orde;" that Renfrew was in possession of the "mid (stream) of the Clyde," and ought to have the customs and anchorage "of that that commys within thaym, the quhilk water of Clyde thai fynde extendis til the [Bla]jkstane; and fra thine downe, the assise decernys of that that is debatable, the profit of yt to be devidit and departit betwene thaim of bathe the burrowis."¹

Notwithstanding the several charters and other documents establishing the rights of Glasgow and the relations of the see with the crown, both Renfrew and Rutherglen appear, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, to have adopted a line of action towards Glasgow which led the then bishop William to appeal to James II. Accordingly, the King, on 4th February, 1449-50, issued letters under his privy seal setting forth the bishop's complaint that both burghs made disturbance and impediment to his lieges and communities of burgh and land that brought goods to the market of Glasgow to sell or buy, doing thereby hurt and prejudice to the privilege and custom granted to the kirk of Glasgow of old time by his Majesty's noble ancestors, used and kept in their time. In consequence of this complaint, the King commanded that none of them should make disturbance, impediment, or hindrance, in any degree, to any of his lieges attending the market of Glasgow with merchandise to sell or buy, but to suffer them to come, go, buy and sell, freely and peaceably, without any demand. He also prohibited the men of these burghs and all others from entering the barony of Glasgow or any lands of St. Mungo's freedom, to take toll or custom, by water or land, of any person coming or going to the said market, notwithstanding any letters of his Majesty's predecessors, granted to the burghs of Rutherglen or Renfrew, or any other burghs, of escheat, or any other tenor, by the which it was the King's will that they should not diminish or prejudice the freedom and kirk of Glasgow or its market, but that it should enjoy, freely and peaceably, all freedoms and privileges as therein written.² About two months later also—viz., on 20th April, 1450—the King granted a charter to the bishop and his successors erecting the city and barony of Glasgow and the lands of Bishopforest into a regality, the jurisdiction thus conferred being second only to that of the royal justiciary.³ He also appealed to the Pope (Nicholas V.) to erect the University of Glasgow, and this was done by a Papal bull on 7th January, 1450-1—forty years later than the establishment of the University of St. Andrews.⁴

¹ Irving's Dumbartonshire, pp. 573-4. Hamilton's Lanark and Renfrew, *ut sup.*, p. 283. See also Dumbarton Burgh Records (1626-1727), p. 30.

² Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 27, No. 20. Hamilton's Lanark and Renfrew, p. 171.

³ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 28, No. 21.

On 22nd February, 1450-1, the King granted a charter to the Bishop and his successors in the same terms as that of 20th April, 1450, the witnesses only being different (*Ibid.*, p. 36, No. 23).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 31, No. 22. On 25th and 26th November, 1454, a great flood in the Clyde

On 31st January, 1466, an Act of Parliament ordained that none of the lieges should sail or pass in merchandise out of the realm, save free burgesses dwelling in burgh, or their familiars, factors or servants living in household with them. From the operation of this law, however, prelates, lords, and clerks were exempt, to the extent that they might send their proper goods with their servants, and buy again things necessary for their proper use. Craftsmen were prohibited from using merchandise by themselves, their factors, or servants, unless they renounced their craft without colour or dissimulation.¹ The royal charters and letters in favour of Glasgow above referred to did not, however, prevent the magistrates and community of Dumbarton from continuing their interference with the traffic of the city, and in 1469 its bishop and magistrates instituted a suit before the Lords Auditors of Causes and Complaints to obtain redress. Both parties were heard, and their respective charters and rights were examined, after which the Lords, on 29th November, 1469, found that Dumbarton had wronged and injured Glasgow by stopping the latter in the buying of wine out of a French ship in the Clyde, and had so broken the privileges, freedom, and infestments granted to it of old. It was therefore ordained to desist and cease "of sic wrangwise stoppin and impediment makin in tyme to cum," and to be punished at the will of the King for the injury done by it.² This decree was ratified by King James III., under the great seal, on 1st December, 1479.³

With a view to the development of the fishing industry as conducive to the common good of the realm, parliament, on 6th May, 1471, resolved that certain lords spiritual and temporal and burghs should provide "schippis, buschis, and uther gret pynk botis" with nets and all other furnishings for fishing, of the form and number to be determined by parliament.⁴

On 15th July, 1476, King James III. granted a charter by which, with consent of parliament, he confirmed to Bishop John and his successors the city of Glasgow, barony of Glasgow, and lands of Bishopforest, to be held in free regality or royalty as one barony, and farther ratified and confirmed all gifts, grants, and foundations made by him or by his predecessors or any other persons to the bishops and prelates of the see, including the power to appoint and remove the provost and magistrates.⁵ King James IV. also, by his charter dated 4th January, 1489-90, confirmed to Bishop Robert and his chapter all gifts, grants,

put all the town of Govan "in ane flote, quhill thai sat on the houssis." (Ane addicoun of Scott's Croniklis, p. 18.)

¹ 1466, c. 1 and 2. Acts of Parliament, I., p. 87.

² Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 54, No. 29. Hamilton's Lanark and Renfrew, pp. 187-8. Irving's Dumbartonshire, pp. 574-5.

³ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 71, No. 34.

⁴ 1471, c. 10. Acts of Parliament, II., p. 100. This Act was by the subsequent Act 1535, c. 18 (*Ibid.*, p. 345) appointed to be put to execution in all points.

⁵ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 60, No. 32.

foundations, and infestments made to the church and see of Glasgow and to its prelates by his royal predecessors or others; with power, *inter alia*, to have a free tron¹ in the city, that all merchandise and goods that pertain to the citizens and tenants of the city and barony might be there troned, weighed, and customed; and that the bishop and his successors might enjoy, for their own use, the customs of the merchandise and goods; and on the merchandise and goods so weighed and customed, cockets were to be given; and thenceforward the citizens and tenants were to be free of exaction or payment of all other customs on those goods in all other towns, ports, and places within the kingdom, on showing these cockets. He also exempted the bishop and his successors for ever from payment of any custom on goods and merchandise from which custom was due, sent by them to any parts beyond sea, on their proper ventures, for buying victuals, wine, wax, spiceries, or other things needful to them, or for the payment of their debts, or for any other needful or proper causes.²

The marriage of James IV. with Margaret, daughter of Henry VII. of England, on 8th August, 1503, was followed for a short time by a peace between the two countries, and a time of prosperity for Scotland such as it had never before known. The commerce with the Low Countries also extended, and the settlement in Scotland of weavers and handcraftsmen from Flanders opened up a new industrial era for the country. This condition of matters was, however, thrown back by the ambitious schemes of Henry VIII., which threw Scotland again into close alliance with France and into conflict with England.

In connection with the Monastery of Paisley, founded by Walter, Steward of Scotland, in 1163—and colonised by monks from the great Cluniac house of Wenlock, in Shropshire—a village gradually arose on the side of the River Cart opposite the monastery, and on 19th August, 1488, it was erected by King James IV. into a free burgh of barony, with power to the inhabitants to buy and sell, in the burgh, wines, wax, woollen and linen cloth, wholesale or retail, and all other goods and wares coming to it, to have bakers, brewers, butchers, &c., and workmen in various craft, a market cross, a weekly market on Monday, and two public fairs yearly, one on St. Mirren's Day and the other on St. Marnoch's Day, with tolls and the other privileges enjoyed by the burghs of Dunfermline, Newburgh, and Arbroath, or any other burgh of barony in Scotland. He also empowered the abbot of Paisley to choose annually the provost, bailies, and other officers of the burgh, to remove them when necessary, and to appoint others.³

¹ The tron was an instrument erected in or near the place at which markets and fairs were held. The balances were suspended from a large cross beam. In early times the weights were generally made of whin stone, and called "the tron stones." They were also "ringed with iron rings," and stamped by authority. In 1365 the great chamberlain was ordained to erect a tron in every port in the kingdom, and to appoint a trouar. *Acts of Parliament*, I., 497. *Ancient Laws and Customs of the Burghs*, p. 190.

² *Glasgow Charters*, I., ii., p. 79, No. 37.

³ *Great Seal Register*, II., p. 374, No. 1768. *Paisley Abbey*, by Dr. Cameron Lees, pp.

This was followed on 18th October, in the same year, by a letter from the King, under his privy seal, to all his lieges, and specially to the burgesses, freemen, and inhabitants of his burghs of Ayr, Irvine, Renfrew, Dumbarton, Rutherglen, and Glasgow, intimating that he had granted to the abbot and convent of Paisley, the town of Paisley, in free burgh of barony, and charging them, under pain of his indignation, not to vex or trouble the abbot and his convent in the exercise of the privileges so conferred.¹ On 2nd June, 1490, the abbot, with consent of his chapter, granted a charter by which he gave, and in feu farm demitted to the provost, bailies, burgesses, and community of his burgh, the burgh and its pertinents, and the lands therein specified, with the various privileges therein set forth, to be held in barony, rendering the burghal farm and service of courts used and wont, with the yearly rents thence owing. By this charter the abbot granted a jurisdiction within the burgh, with power to hold burgh courts and appoint sergeants and other subordinate officers, and to make burgesses. But he reserved to himself and his successors the right to appoint the magistrates.²

On 17th October, 1488, the first Parliament of James IV. enacted that in time to come all manner of ships, strangers and others, should come to his free burghs, such as Dumbarton, Ayr, Irvine, Wigtown, Kirkcudbright, Renfrew, and other free burghs, and there make their merchandise; and that strangers should buy no fish but salted and barrelled, nor buy any other merchandise save at free burghs, and there pay their duties and customs and take their coquet as effeirs. The act farther provides that "nain of our Soverane Lordis lieges tak schippis to fraucht under colour to defraud oure Soverane Lord or his liegis, under the pane of tynsall of thar lifis and gudis; and that na strangear do in the contrar, under the pain of tynsall and confiseacioun of thair schip and gudis to oure Soverane Lordis use."³ This enactment—doubtless intended to effect two objects, the security of the crown revenue as well as the profit of the burghs—applied to all free burghs, *i.e.*, burghs entitled to freedom of trade, including Rutherglen and Glasgow. The King also, by precept under his seal and subscription manual, dated 20th October, 1490, commanded the observance of a decree by James III. and his council, in terms similar to those of the Act of 1488, c. 12, and ordered the admiral and his deputes to make diligent inquisition after the breakers.⁴

152-153. Charter Documents, &c., of Paisley, 1163-1665 (Metcalfe), pp. 29-31. Municipal Corporation Reports, II., p. 283. Brown's History of Paisley, I., p. 140.

¹ Charters and Documents of Paisley (Metcalfe), p. 32. Registrum Monasterii de Passelet, p. 274.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 32-39. Brown's Paisley, I., pp. 142-5. Paisley Abbey, pp. 154-158. The charters of 1488 and 1490 were ratified by Parliament on 11th May, 1648 (Acts of Parliament, VI., 2, p. 82).

³ 1488, c. 12, Acts of Parliament, II., p. 209.

⁴ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 87, No. 38. See also Hamilton's Lanark and Renfrew, pp. 188-9, where precept is dated 6th October, 1490.

Through the influence of James IV. the bishopric of Glasgow was, on 14th January, 1488-9, created by the Scottish Parliament into an archbishopric, with the same privileges as those of York,¹ notwithstanding much opposition, especially by the archbishop of St. Andrews, who appealed to the Papal court. But, after considerable delay, Pope Innocent VIII., on 9th January, 1491-2, issued his bull declaring the see to be metropolitan, and appointing the bishops of Dunkeld, Dunblane, Galloway and Argyle to be its suffragans.²

A few days later—viz., on 17th January, 1491-2—the King granted a letter to the provost and bailies of Glasgow, on whom he had apparently placed some restriction, authorising them to use their freedoms as they had previously done.³

That Dumbarton was the port and “naval base” of the West of Scotland in the latter half of the fifteenth and the former half of the sixteenth centuries is indicated by entries in the Lord Treasurer's accounts, the Exchequer Rolls, &c. In 1487 reference is made to the purchase of a ship by James III., at the price of £130, and an expenditure upon it there of £276 for repairs, artillery, anchors, cables, “schipmens feyis,” and other equipments.⁴ In 1495 James IV. visited the Isles, arriving at Dumbarton from Glasgow in the first week of May. In anticipation of this visit a great row-barge and two small boats were built, and a ship repaired. Details as to their building and equipment are given.⁵ In 1498 canvas was bought to mend the sails of the King's ship, then in the harbour.⁶ In 1503-4 the fleet to be despatched to suppress risings in the Isles was fitted out and victualled there,⁷ and was inspected by the King. In 1504-5, 1506, 1506-7, and 1507 James was making strenuous effort to create a navy. One ship, called the “Margaret,” was built in Leith, another in Brittany, and a third in Dumbarton. Sir James Balfour Paul says this was perhaps the earliest recorded specimen of that

¹ 1488, c. 2, Acts of Parliament, II., p. 213.

² Regist. Epis. Glasguensis, pp., 470-3. Theiner Vet. Mun., p. 505.

³ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 88, No. 39.

In the pleadings for Glasgow, in the action of Declarator raised by it against Dumbarton, and decided by the Court of Session in 1666—to which reference has been made—an indenture between these burghs, entered into in 1499, is referred to. By it both burghs are represented to have contracted and agreed for all times thereafter to a mutual compliance and correspondence, and the defence and maintenance of each of the others' privileges, condescending to an equal interest of the Clyde, neither of them pretending privilege or prerogative over the other (Glasgow Charters, II., p. 62, No. 136). Neither this document nor a transcript of it has however been preserved. Perhaps the “indenture” is that which was referred to as a “band” and “contrak” in proceedings between Dumbarton and Renfrew in 1524, and between Dumbarton and Glasgow in 1531 (See Glasgow Protocols, No. 1103, and footnote).

⁴ Lord Treasurer's Accounts, I., pp. xcvi., 125.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I., pp. ccxxvii., 245, 254.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I., p. 390.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II., pp. xliii., xciii., 430.

Clyde shipbuilding which has in later days become so famous.¹ In 1507 reference is made to a bark built there.² The death of the King at Flodden on 9th September, 1513, however, terminated the career of shipbuilding in which he had indulged, though Dumbarton continued to be a harbour for such royal ships as came to the West coast. In 1512 payments were made for the building of a galley in Glasgow³. In July, 1515, two of the King's ships were lying at Dumbarton, and £40 were expended by the Lord Treasurer in making docks for them. On 17th May John Duke of Albany arrived in Ayr to assume the regency after the death of James IV., and the fleet of eight French ships which accompanied him went to Dumbarton on the following day.⁴ For some of these, docks appear to have been constructed.⁵ In 1516 reference is made to the provisioning of two ships, the "Margaret" and "James," at Dumbarton;⁶ to the conveyance of arms and ammunition from it to Glasgow and Edinburgh;⁷ and to the provisioning of King's ships in the burgh.⁸ In 1534 the ship which brought James V. from Argyll lay in Dumbarton for some weeks,⁹ and the great naval expedition which, in 1540, sailed from Leith, after circumnavigating Scotland to establish the King's authority, went to the harbour of Dumbarton. From it also, eight years later, the young Queen Mary sailed for France, to be there educated.

Notwithstanding the restrictions imposed upon merchandise and foreign trade, the commercial relations of Scotland with foreign countries were so far extended by the beginning of the sixteenth century as to necessitate legislation dealing with the recovering of debts and the settlement of disputes arising between Scottish merchants and subjects in parts beyond the sea. With that view it was enacted on 15th March, 1503-4, that for the weal of these merchants, and in view of the exorbitant expenses incurred by them, the Conservator of Scotland should have jurisdiction to do justice between them. But he was prohibited from acting unless six of the best and most honest merchants, of most knowledge of the realm (if so many could be got, or, if not, four), should sit and administer justice along with him. Merchants were prohibited from pursuing each other before any other judge beyond sea, under pain of £5 to the King, to be paid by the pursuer, with expenses to the party pursued.¹⁰ On the same day an act ordained that all merchants of the realm and the burghs should enjoy the freedoms and privileges granted to them of old; that no person dwelling outside of burghs should use merchandise nor tap or sell wine, wax, silk, spicey, woad, nor such like stuff

¹ Lord Treasurer's Accounts, III., pp. lxvii., 83, 84, 85, 296, 298, 351, 357; IV., xiii.

² *Ibid.*, IV., pp. xiii., 78.

³ *Ibid.*, IV., p. 290.

⁴ *Ibid.*, V., pp. xxxiii., 16.

⁵ *Ibid.*, V., p. 17.

⁶ Exchequer Rolls, XIV., pp. 144, 149, 223, 290.

⁷ Exchequer Rolls, XIV., p. 162.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 223, 290, 436.

⁹ Lord Treasurer's Accounts, VI., 233-236.

¹⁰ 1503. cc. 32, 36. Acts of Parliament, II., pp. 244, 252.

nor staple goods; and that no man should pack or peil in places out of the King's burghs, under pain of escheat of their goods for the King's use.¹

For several years after the erection of Paisley into a free burgh of barony, contests took place between it and the royal burgh of Renfrew, which claimed to have the exclusive privilege of buying and selling and of levying toll and custom through Renfrewshire. This claim was, however, ultimately resisted by Paisley, and, in the endeavour to assert its claim, the magistrates and burgesses of Renfrew threw down the market cross of the burgh of barony, and seized some beef, cheese, and white cloth which was there exposed for sale. But the bailies of Paisley rescued the goods seized, and thereupon in 1493 the bailies, burgesses, and community of Renfrew instituted an action before the Lords Auditors against the bailies of the abbot of Paisley for defrauding the king in his customs and usurping the privileges and freedom of Renfrew and taking from its customers and officers the goods poinded and taken by them for their customs in Paisley. All the parties interested being heard the Lords Auditors found that the bailies of Paisley had done no fraud to the king nor usurped the privilege of Renfrew in taking from its customers and officers the poinds taken in Paisley, because the town and lands of Paisley were created in a free barony and regality, "as was previt be a charter under Kyng Robertis grete sele of the date precedand the infestment made to the said toun of Renfrew, and als becaus the said toun of Renfrew is privilegit bot of the landis within thar burgh and barony of Renfrew."²

Of the commercial relations of Scotland with the Continent between 1492 and 1503, the ledger of Andrew Halyburton, conservator of the privileges of the Scots nation in the Netherlands, affords glimpses. During the reign of James IV. Scotland enjoyed an exceptional period of quiet and prosperity, and the mercantile transactions of the conservator give some indications of what trade then existed between it and the Netherlands. The exports appear to have consisted mainly of wool, salmon, trout, sheep skins, rabbit skins, marten skins, and coarse cloth, In return for them were received imports of church vessels, claret, table cloths, towelling, velvet, fine cloth, linen, cambrics, silk, satin, damask, taffety, ribbons, sewing silk, embroidery, gold and silver leaf and thread. Neither brandy nor strong waters appear among the imported articles, and tobacco was not introduced into Scotland till some time after its introduction into England, in the end of the sixteenth century.

¹ 1503, c. 37. Acts of Parliament, II., p. 245. These statutes are repeated on 20th March, 1503-4. 1503, cc. 26-29. *Ibid.*, II., p. 252.

² Registrum Monasterii de Passelet, pp. 403-4.

Hamilton's Renfrewshire, pp. 273-4.

Municipal Corporation Reports, II., pp. 283, 355.

The charter referred to in the text appears to have been that which was granted by King Robert III. to the abbot and monks of Paisley in 1396.

On 8th August, 1511, King James IV. granted to the burgh of Irvine a charter by which he confirmed all its charters, rights, and privileges.¹

On the last day of February, 1519-20, during the minority of King James V. and the governorship of John, duke of Albany, heir presumptive to the throne, it was represented to the town council of Edinburgh that the Governor thought it necessary that there should be a staple in the parts of Flanders to which Scots merchants might resort and have order amongst themselves as other nations had. He therefore desired that the community of merchants would declare which of the three towns of Campvere, Middleburgh, or Bruges was most convenient for the staple. The merchants of Edinburgh and good men of the town thought the town of Middleburgh most convenient, so that other burghs of the realm would, like Edinburgh, repair thereto on obtaining such privileges as had been granted before and as might be desired.²

In 1524 the old disputes as to the navigation of the Clyde, and other matters, seem to have brought Renfrew and Dumbarton again into collision, and an effort appears to have been made to effect an arrangement. With that view representatives of each burgh met on 18th May of that year in the church of Kilpatrick, but no arrangement was come to. The record of the conference is, however, interesting. The representatives of Dumbarton having asked those of Renfrew of what they had to complain, they alleged that Dumbarton had failed in various ways—(1) they had made a bond and federation with Glasgow without their leave, and (2) John Palmer, bailie of Dumbarton, had intromitted with the custom and toll of a French ship within their bounds and freedoms, &c. The representatives of Dumbarton then asked what right and evidents Renfrew had to instruct its complaint, whereupon Renfrew produced a letter with divers seals, and, as alleged, a testimonial with a transumpt of the letter. Dumbarton then asked whether Renfrew had any other letters or documents to instruct its claim, but Renfrew declined to show any other evidents at that time, and refused to agree to proposals submitted by Dumbarton. So matters remained unsettled.³

An indication of shipping trade on the Clyde in the first half of the sixteenth century is given in the Protocol Book of Matthew Forsyth, notary public, apparently of Dumbarton. It records on 2nd February, 1525, an authorisation by seven persons to three others, one of whom, Michael Fleming, is described as a "citizen of Glasgow," to appear before the regent of England to obtain restoration of gold, silver, hides, woollen cloth, and pickled salmon, belonging to them, and captured on the coast of England by the English and Spanish, on the ship "James," of Dumbarton, belonging to the Earl of Arran.⁴

¹ Muntiments of Irvine, I., p. 30. Ratified by parliament on 17th November, 1641. 1641, c. 358. Acts of Parliament, V., p. 568.

² Convention Records, I., p. 544. Middleburgh was not adopted as the staple port till the year 1511 (*antea*, p. 12; *postea*, p. 22).

³ Glen's History of Dumbarton, p. 148 Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 575.

⁴ Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 575.

Still later, the great naval expedition with which, in 1540, James V. sailed from Leith and circumnavigated Scotland to establish his authority, went to the harbour of Dumbarton.

Notwithstanding the several grants to Glasgow above enumerated, the burghs of Renfrew and Rutherglen appear to have obstructed the free entrance of goods to the market of Glasgow, and to have necessitated an appeal to the courts of law. In this Glasgow succeeded so far as to obtain a decree against both burghs, on 10th June, 1542, ordaining letters to be directed charging their inhabitants to suffer the several kinds of goods therein specified to be brought to the market.¹ The obstruction thus offered to Glasgow on *legal* grounds, and so removed, could not, however, affect the *physical* obstruction occasioned by the condition of the river bed. Dr. Cleland mentions that, in 1556, huts were erected near Dumbuck—twelve miles below the bridge of Glasgow—and inhabitants of Glasgow, Renfrew, and Dumbarton entered into an agreement to work on the river for six weeks at a time, *per vices*, with a view chiefly to remove the ford at Dumbuck and the most prominent *hirsts* (sandbanks).² This operation was no doubt of advantage by facilitating the passage of boats and small vessels to Glasgow, but, even as regarded these, left much to be desired, there being no river banks, and the shore being so rugged and irregular that the tide flowed over a great space, forming pools and islands, which caused trouble and delay even to the insignificant traffic of the period.

On 11th June, 1542, James V. granted another charter to Rutherglen.³

On the 28th of the same month, King James V. granted a charter to Renfrew by which he confirmed that by Robert III. of 1397, and farther conveyed to the burgesses and community and their successors that burgh with its fishings in the Clyde and pertinents, with the whole burgh fermes, petty customs, and tolls, as well within the burgh as without, through the whole barony of Renfrew, with mills, multures, and sequels, &c. He granted also that the burgesses should be free of all tolls and small customs, as were other Scottish burgesses.⁴

At a Convention of Burghs held at Edinburgh on 14th April, 1527, Master John Campbell of Lundy was appointed to go to Flanders to renew the peace between Scotland and the realms belonging to the Emperor, and obtain the renewal of the privileges granted of old to the merchants of Scotland, and also to purchase other privileges necessary for the weal of the realm, and specially the following:—that Scotland should enjoy its old privileges understood to be “six

¹ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 117, No. 49. Confirmed by King James VI. on 8th July, 1596. *Ibid.*, p. 247, No. 84.

² Abridgment of the Annals of Glasgow (1817), p. 371.

³ Municipal Corporation Reports, II., 371. It is not recorded in the printed Great Seal Register.

⁴ Great Seal Register, III., p. 626, No. 2705. Privy Seal Register, XVI., p. 22. Municipal Corporation Reports, II., p. 355.

grit of the sek ;" that merchants passing to Flanders should clothe themselves in honest clothes effeiring to their faculty ; that every merchant sailing to Flanders should have half a last of goods of his own, or as much in storage, under pain of £10 ; that no person dwelling outside of the king's free burghs should send any goods, or use any kind of merchandice to sail or send beyond sea in France or Flanders, under pain of escheat of the goods—one half to be applied to the king's use and the other half to the common good of the burgh from which the merchant came ; and that no Scots merchant should plea or pursue another in Flanders except before the Conservator, after the form of the Acts of Parliament.¹

As illustrating the relative importance of the undernoted burghs in 1535, it may be noted that an allocation of 5,000 merks among all the royal and free burghs imposed £833 upon Edinburgh, £28 2s. 6d. on Dumbarton, £33 15s. on Renfrew, £22 10s. on each of Rothesay and Rutherglen, £45 on Irvine, £67 10s. on Glasgow. Aberdeen had to bear £315 ; Dundee, £321 17s. 6d. ; and Perth, £247 10s.²

In April, 1540, a contract as to the staple trade was entered into between the city of Antwerp and the city of Edinburgh, on behalf of the burghs of Scotland, by which it was arranged that the latter should have a "fair and pleasant house" for the residence of the Conservator and others of Scotland, in which their merchandice might be lodged. By this contract also the cognisance of all disputes between Scotsmen was appointed to belong to the Conservator ; and it was appointed that Scottish merchants might sell in Antwerp all kinds of merchandise, and particularly salt fish, and that a wharf in a commodious place should be appointed, in which their ships and merchandice might be unloaded.³

On 19th May, 1541, a contract as to the staple trade between the city of Middleburgh and the city of Edinburgh and other burghs of Scotland was entered into. It set forth that for the love which the representatives of Middleburgh bore to the kingdom of Scotland they granted to it the privileges, liberties, and immunities therein set forth so long as the burghs kept their residence and staple in Middleburgh. By this deed, *inter alia*, all possible aid, assistance, and advice, whensoever required, was guaranteed to the Scottish merchants ; Middleburgh engaged to provide "a very gentle house, worthy of the said nation," in which their Conservator or any other Scotsman might be lodged, and kept free of all excises, imposts, and taxes upon ale and wine imposed for behoof of the town ; and to erect and furnish a chapel, with altar therein provided with all necessary ornaments.⁴

¹ Convention Records, I., pp. 508-512.

² *Ibid.*, p. 514.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 546-50.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 551-4. On 19th December, 1545, David Painter, secretary to Queen Mary, delivered to Mr. James Foulis of Colinton, clerk of Register, a treaty made by Mr. David, as ambassador for Scotland, with the Emperor "tuiching the frequenting and hanting of

On 20th June, 1555, an act of parliament, referring to the increasing dearth in the country of victuals and flesh, caused by the export of these, prohibited their removal from the country, except in so far as might be necessary for victualling ships and vessels during their voyage. But it provided that the inhabitants of the burghs of Ayr, Irvine, Glasgow, and Dumbarton, and others dwelling at the West Seas, might take baken bread, brewed ale, and aquavite to the Isles, to barter with other merchandise. This act was, moreover, extended to the masters and skippers of vessels which received such victuals, flesh, and tallow, as well as to the owners of the goods.¹

On the same day another act set forth that the whole burghs of the West country—such as Irvine, Ayr, Dumbarton, Glasgow, and others—had annually, in all time, resorted to the fishing of Lochfyne and other lochs in the North Isles, to fish for herring and other fishes, and, after finishing their business, left at their pleasure, without being subjected to any exaction save paying the fishers. Nevertheless certain countrymen residing beside Lochfyne had exacted an *ad valorem* custom on every last of made herring taken in the loch, as large as the Queen's custom. This exaction had never before been made, and was a serious injury to the burghs. It was, therefore, ordered that all such exactions should cease, under pain of those who made them being punished as oppressors.²

merchandis to Flanders, and sik lik the Emperouris subjectis to this realme" (Privy Council Register, I., p. 18). A few years later (1550) this treaty was endangered by a high-handed proceeding on the part of the Flemings in seizing a fleet of fourteen Scottish merchant ships, richly laden with Flanders ware (*Ibid.*, pp. 92, 104).

In 1550 the burghs had to bear a taxation of 2,454 crowns of the sum to furnish an embassy to the Emperor for peace. Of this sum Edinburgh had to bear 600 crowns; Dumbarton, 20; Renfrew, 24; Rutherglen and Rothesay, 16 each; Irvine, 32; Glasgow, 64; while Aberdeen had to bear 226; Dundee, 304; and Perth, 180 (Convention Records, I., p. 519).

¹ 1555, e. 14. Acts of Parliament, II., p. 495.

² *Ibid.*, c. 28. II., p. 498. In his general description of Renfrewshire, published in 1710, George Crawford gives an account of the herring fishing in the Clyde. "The herrings which are caught there," he says, "being larger, firmer, and of a better taste and taking better with the salt than any other the kingdom affords, are more valued, both fresh and salted, at home and abroad. When the fishing was considerable in the river Clyde there have been boats employed in catching herrings about nine hundred, built after the form of little galleys, each boat having on board four men and twenty-four nets, every net being six fathoms long, and a fathom and a half in breadth, all joined together, making a considerable length. Anciently none were allowed to fish till the 25th of July, about which time the shoals used to come from the sea which is called Lochin; and such as went a-fishing before that day were liable to a certain pecunial mulct. I understand that, anciently, the boats went a-fishing three times a year, which times were called the Drave; and there was payable to the Crown, out of each boat, of such a bigness as was then determined, a thousand herring each Drave, and were afterward paid by a measure of a fixed size and bigness, from which that duty came to be called the Assize Herring; which, by Act of Parliament, in the reign of King James III., was annexed to the crown" (Archæological and Historical Collections relating to the county of Renfrew, I.,

At the same time the act 1488, c. 12, was ordered to be published of new and put to execution, and it was farther ordained that no person should buy merchandise from strangers, but only from freemen at free ports of burghs, under pain of confiscation of all the goods bought, and of all the movable goods of the contravener to be applied to the use of the Queen.¹

Three months later—viz., on 18th September—the convention of burghs passed an act in which—because of the great hurt daily done, and apparently to be done, by freemen binding themselves in company with unfreemen and others, and colouring unfreemen's goods, under pretence of their liberty, to the great defraud of free merchandise, and of the customs and haven silver of burghs—it prohibited all freemen of every burgh from associating in merchandise or receiving from any unfreeman goods with which to traffic to his profit. Violation of this order was appointed to be followed by the offender losing his freedom, and being punished in his person as mansworn and perjured.² At the same time an act was passed against the practices of divers skippers and owners of ships, freemen as well as unfreemen, who daily freighted their ships with forestallers and unfreemen, to the great injury of the common weal of burghs. It was, therefore, ordered that no ships should be freighted save in the presence of the dean of guild of the burgh, and that none should sail without his ticket.³

On 27th September, 1555, a commission by the magistrates of Edinburgh on behalf of the burghs of Scotland was granted to two persons residing in Dieppe and Rouen to prosecute or otherwise arrange with the receivers and treasurers of customs and tributes at Rouen for unjust customs and tributes levied by them from Scottish merchants trading in Rouen.⁴

On 16th April, 1556, Queen Mary granted a charter under her great seal, in which, reciting various privileges and liberties granted by her predecessors to the craftsmen of burghs, and the abatement of these privileges by an act of parliament passed in the previous year,⁵ her Majesty, for the reasons there stated, granted a pp. 4, 5). See also Renwick's Glasgow Memorials, pp. 222-3, and authorities there cited.

The Appendix to the Fourth Report of the Historical MSS. Commissioners refers to several leases to the Argyll family of the assize herrings of the West Seas, including the Clyde where the sea flows, from 1561 till 1705. It states that in the old rentals of the Argyll estates the annual value of the assize herrings to that family was larger than the annual land rental of the estate of Roseneath (Historical MSS. Commissioners Report, Argyll Family, p. 481).

On 30th April, 1573, fishers of herrings and white fish were ordained by parliament to bring them to free ports, there to be sold to the lieges, and the rest to be sold to free men. The act was passed to remedy some irregular practices whereby the king was defrauded of his customs, and the lieges “wantis the fruit of the sey appointit be God for thair nurischment, and the burgessis and fremen disappointit of thair traffique and commoditie” (1573, c. 7. Acts of Parliament, III., p. 83).

¹ 1555, c. 37. Acts of Parliament, II., p. 499.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I., p. 557.

² Convention Records, I., pp. 11, 12.

⁵ 1555, c. 26. Acts of Parliament, II., p. 497.

³ *Ibid.*, I., p. 12.

dispensation of that act so far as it opposed and restricted the liberties and privileges formerly granted, all of which were ratified and approved, and, among other things, the craftsmen were authorised to "navigate and use and exercise merchandise of all sorts within our said kingdom, and beyond the same, as shall seem to them most advantageous."¹

Meanwhile important changes were taking place in Scotland. The doctrines of the Reformation had been accepted by a number of the burghs, and were openly avowed by many influential nobles and persons of influence. The position of the prelates and beneficed persons of the old faith was in consequence becoming precarious, even before the Reformation was recognised by the Estates. The necessity on the part of these dignitaries to fortify their tenure of their benefices induced them so to ally themselves with powerful secular nobles as to secure their support in the struggle which was becoming inevitable. With this view, James Beaton, archbishop of Glasgow, with the advice of his chapter, appointed James duke of Chatelherault, earl of Arran, lord Hamilton and his heirs, to be his bailies of the lands, barony and regality of Glasgow for a period of nineteen years,² and in 1557-8 the duke, in accordance with the practice of those troublous times, granted the archbishop a bond of maintenance, by which he undertook to protect the see in all its rights and privileges.³ But the trust thus reposed in the duke proved unavailing. When the storm burst, Chatelherault professed the reformed doctrine, and after the death of the Queen Regent on 10th June, 1560, the Archbishop, recognising the fact that the party of the Reformation were masters of Scotland, proceeded to France, taking with him the acts and records of his cathedral. In August, 1560, the Scottish Estates approved of the Confession of Faith, repealed or revoked all acts authorising any other form of belief or worship, and abjured the authority of the Pope. When, therefore, the time arrived for appointing the magistrates of Glasgow, in 1561, neither the archbishop nor any one holding his authority could be found to nominate the new magistrates, and they were accordingly appointed without such nomination.⁴ The action of the Estates in August, 1560, was confirmed by Parliament in December, 1567.⁵ "So," says Burton, "the Reformation really was established in Scotland."⁶

¹ This charter was ratified by Queen Mary after attaining her majority, by charter dated 1st March, 1564-5 (MS. Great Seal Register, lib. 33, Nos. 192, 195. Printed Register, IV., p. 235, No. 1054; p. 367, No. 1583. Convention Records, II., pp. 469-476).

² In 1545 Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow, constituted James, Earl of Arran, governor of Scotland, and his heirs, bailies, and justices of the barony and regality for nineteen years (MSS. Hamilton Papers. Historical MSS. Commission, XI. Report, p. 221).

³ Glasgow Charters, I., part ii., p. 125, No. 56.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I., ii., p. 126, No. 57.

⁵ 1567, c. 3 and 4. Acts of Parliament, III., p. 14.

⁶ History of Scotland, IV., 320. About this time the population of Glasgow is said to have been about 4,500.

On 4th June, 1563, an act of parliament confirmed all statutes, privileges, and immunities granted by the Sovereign or her predecessors in favour of the burghs, their magistrates, and indwellers, with all letters and executorials that had passed or might pass thereon, and commanded the lords of Council and Session to give and direct such reasonable letters as they or any of them should desire or had previously obtained charging the lieges that none of them should violate the statutes, ordinances, immunities, or other privileges granted to the burghs, under the pains contained in the same.¹ Four years later—viz., on 26th December, 1567—an act prohibited unfreemen, both within and without burgh, from using merchandise or liberties of merchants, or from sailing to France, Flanders, or other parts, to that effect, under pain of confiscation of their goods.²

On 20th April, 1565, on a complaint by the merchants of Scotland trading in France, Charles IX., King of France, ordered no more customs to be taken from the Scots nation for wine than was exigible under old treaties which the king had no intention to alter or innovate.³

¹ 1563, c. 24. Acts of Parliament, II.,
p. 544.

² 1567, c. 56. Acts of Parliament, III.,
p. 41.

³ Convention Records, I., p. 559.

II.

REIGN OF KING JAMES VI. OF SCOTLAND, 1567-1603.

On the abdication of Queen Mary on 24th July, 1567,¹ she was succeeded by her son, James VI., who was then only about 13 months old, and a succession of regents were appointed till the king assumed the government in 1578.²

During the regency of the Earl of Lennox a deed of gift, dated 8th April, 1571, was granted by the Regent, Mathew Earl of Lennox, in name of the young King James VI., by which, after referring to the troubles and intestine wars which had impoverished Glasgow, and specially to the effect which the recent treasonable holding of the castle of Dumbarton had upon the traffic of the city, by subjecting it to exactions by the holders of the castle, it was empowered to

¹ Though in the reign of Queen Mary Glasgow held but the eleventh place in taxable value, it was chief among the Scottish towns for beauty and attractiveness. It was, in truth, the only place in Scotland, says Professor Hume Brown, regarding which strangers expressed themselves with unqualified enthusiasm. In the latter half of the fifteenth century Hardlyng described it as a “goodly cytee” (Early Travellers, &c., p. 23), and alike by its situation and the nobility and picturesqueness of its buildings it must have fully deserved the eulogy. To modern eyes the uncontaminated Clyde, with its adjoining meadows, and spanned by its magnificent bridge of eight arches, would have seemed a glorious adornment in itself. And the town was not unworthy of its natural advantages. Dominating its precincts was the Cathedral, venerable even in the time of Mary, and close by it the stately Bishop’s Palace, while clustering round them were the homes of the thirty-two prebends, each with its garden or orchard attached (Scotland in the time of Queen Mary, p. 44).

² The following were the regents:—(1) James Stewart, earl of Moray, who was nominated regent by Queen Mary on 24th July, 1567. He accepted the office on 22nd August, 1567; his appointment was confirmed by parliament on 20th December, 1567, and he was shot in Linlithgow on 23rd January, 1569-70. (2) Matthew Stewart, earl of Lennox, the king’s grandfather, who was proclaimed regent on 27th January, 1569-70, and his election was confirmed by Parliament on 13th October, 1570. He was shot at Stirling, and died on 4th September, 1571. (3) John Erskine, earl of Mar, was elected regent on 5th September, and accepted the office in parliament at Stirling on 6th September, 1571. He died in October, 1572. (4) James Douglas, earl of Morton, was elected regent and accepted the office in a parliament at Edinburgh on 24th November, 1572. He resigned it on 12th March, 1577-8, and on conviction of being accessory to the murder of Darnley was beheaded at the Cross in Edinburgh on 2nd June, 1581. As approved by parliament on 15th July, 1578, the King assumed the government when he was only a little over twelve years of age.

levy, during the pleasure of the granters, specified dues on herring or other fishes belonging to freemen or unfreemen of the burgh, transported from or brought to the bridge of the city. This gift was explained as necessary for the “weill of the inhabitantis, and common weill of the haill cuntrie”—the bridge, “throw the oft inundationis, greit fludis and stormis that hes occurrit and discendit doun the watter in tyme of frost, and specialie this last winter,” having been “sa troublit, dung down and dampnageit with greit trowpis of yis (ice), that, gif the samyn be not spedlie redressit and ordourit to the former estait,” would extend to the “disprofeit of our haill realme.”¹

On 8th July, 1572, King James VI., with consent of the Regent, granted a charter to Irvine of the kirk livings within the burgh,² and in the same month Archibald earl of Argyle, Lord Justice-General of Scotland, granted to the burgh of Irvine Letters of Protection, by which, referring to the protection which his predecessors had given to the magistrates and community in time past, he declared that they had come under his protection and safeguard. He therefore engaged in all their travels, suits, and business, to assist and fortify them, and to resist attacks upon them, as upon himself. This document was subscribed by the earl and by the provost, bailies, and town-clerk in July, 1572.³

Previous to the latter half of the eighteenth century, the Clyde was practically what nature had made it, and was so shallow as to admit of the passage only of boats and small vessels. It frequently also overflowed its banks and submerged the adjoining lands. To improve these conditions somewhat, the inhabitants of Glasgow expended labour and money from time to time in removing stones and other obstructions from the channel, and references to these efforts appear occasionally in the records of the burgh.⁴

The Council Records of Glasgow and those of the other burghs of the Clyde, with the records of the Convention of Burghs, the Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, and the Privy Council records, afford frequent illustrations of the practical working of the old laws constituting and protecting the exclusive privileges of early royal and free burghs. As affording interesting glimpses of the narrow commercial restrictions of the time and the power which the Convention of Burghs then exercised, frequent references are made to them.

On 4th June, 1575, Rutherglen appears to have complained to the lords of council and session against the exactions of Glasgow, whose freedom and liberty of free burgh, it was alleged, “dependis upon the previlege of the burgh regale of

¹ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., 146, No. 62.

³ Muniments of Irvine, I., pp. 59, 60.

² Confirmed by the Act, 1641, c. 358.

Acts of Parliament, V., 568.

⁴ The council records of Glasgow, so far as known to exist, commence only on 19th January, 1573-4, and are awanting for the period from 27th April, 1586, till 22nd October, 1588; from 31st July, 1590, till 5th October, 1594; from 27th October, 1601, till 13th June, 1605; and from 28th August, 1613, till 30th September, 1623.

Dumbartaine." These exactions consisted, *inter alia*, of a ladleful of every sack of victual brought into the market of Glasgow, which exaction was stated to have been applied in sweeping and cleansing the causeway, according to the practice of other burghs. The city pleaded its charters and immemorial practice, and, having been allowed a proof, led probation, after which the lords decreed in its favour.¹

On 4th January, 1575-6, two burgesses of Ayr, the master and owner of a ship called the *Elizabeth*, of Ayr, lying at Newark, appeared before the magistrates of Glasgow and Dumbarton and confessed that they had usurped the privilege of those burghs by breaking bulk and selling salt in small within their freedom. The magistrates thereupon went to the ship with an officer of arms and removed some of the sails and other articles, after which the master and owner placed themselves in the will of the magistrates, and, having engaged not to usurp the towns' privileges in future, were discharged, and had the sails and articles restored to them.²

On 5th February, 1575-6, King James VI., with consent of James Earl of Morton, then regent of the kingdom, granted to Renfrew a charter confirming all its rights in the various altarages and kirk livings therein specified, and specially its constitution and rights as a royal burgh, with the rights and privileges belonging to it as such.³

In October, 1577, one Blankschew of Bretagne brought his ship, laden with salt and merchandise, into the port of Irvine, and, having discharged a large part of his cargo, took his ship to the road of Little Comray and anchored it there, to wait till wind and weather admitted of his returning to Bretagne. But on the 22nd of the month a party of about twenty-four men, from Glasgow and other places, boarded his vessel about midnight, and removed it, with some of its mariners, to Lamlash, where the mariners were put on shore, and the vessel was to proceed to sea in open robbery. A complaint was accordingly presented to the Privy Council against the offenders, and also against John Crawfurd, brother of the laird of Jordanhill, by whose persuasion "it was brutit" that the deed was committed, and they were charged to appear and answer to the complaint; but they failed to do so, and were denounced rebels.⁴

On 15th August, 1579, King James VI. granted to Irvine⁵ the customs of the burgh, extending to the sum of twenty-nine merks yearly, for a period of five years,

¹ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 164, No. 65.

² Glasgow Council Records, I., pp. 46-47.

³ Great Seal Register, IV., p. 76, No. 2511. This charter was ratified by Parliament on 17th November, 1641 (Acts of Parliament, V., p. 456), under protest by Glasgow and the lairds of Houston and Newark (*Ibid.*, p. 574-5, 719).

⁴ Privy Council Register, II., 633-4.

⁵ Bishop Leslie, writing in 1578, refers to Irvine—"quhilke in peple, in riches, and comodiousness of the sey port is nocht mekle inferiour to Air;" which, again, he describes as "illustir and fair anuich baith in riches and biging, and a pleasand situation with a prettie

to be applied in “beiting and repairing” its havin and port, which had become decayed and broken.¹

In consequence of a complaint made by the magistrates of Irvine to the Privy Council, and remitted for decision by the Convention, it was ordered, in February, 1579-80, that when the town was stented a tax roll was stented to be made up as in other burghs, and the town council was to depute sworn men of the town to tax every one according to his ability.²

An act of the privy council, dated 23rd August, 1580, dealing with a complaint by Renfrew against Glasgow and Dumbarton, illustrates the high-handed way in which the defenders are said to have acted in the exercise of what they may be presumed to have considered their rights in the Clyde. Renfrew had bought from a burgess of Ayr a quantity of salt, which on 11th August the owners, burgesses of Renfrew, had taken in five of their boats, intending to proceed to Renfrew. But when opposite Dumbarton Castle the boats were attacked by two Glasgow and Dumbarton boats, each occupied by twenty-four hagbutters, who seized the Renfrew boats, removed a portion of the salt, captured the owners, and carried them, with two of the Renfrew boats, to Dumbarton, where they were imprisoned—not only refusing to liberate the prisoners or to restore the salt, but prohibiting by public intimation all persons resorting to Renfrew from buying or selling any kind of merchandise or importing such into it, under pain of the same being confiscated and applied to the use of the magistrates of Glasgow and Dumbarton. Renfrew appealed to the privy council. Glasgow and Dumbarton appeared, and asserted their claims in the most uncompromising form. But after hearing the parties the privy council (1) remitted the decision of the rights, liberties, and privileges of the parties to the lords of council and session as the only judges competent thereto; (2) meanwhile ordered the defendants to restore the salt, boats, sails, anchoirs, &c., to the complainers, under caution to make the same furthcoming as the law might direct; and (3) ordained all the parties to desist from innovation to the hurt of each others’ privileges in time coming, otherwise than by order of law.³

Whether the state of matters thus revealed induced Renfrew to seek the protection of the earl of Argyle does not appear, but on 21st October, 1580, the bailies, council, and community entered into a peculiar contract whereby
 sey porte, quhair strange natiouns oft arryues, and thair landes, the port is sa commodious” (Scotland before 1700, p. 119). Referring to Renfrew, the Bishop says:—“To this toune is privilege of salmone takeing, granted [to] thair forbearis betuene the twa brayes [banks] of Clyde. The takeris gyve sik labour to fisheing that thair oft may be sene hail lx. of fisher botes occupiet in fisheing all baith the spring and summer tyme; bot for al that the mater uses sa to succeid with thame, that sum of thame hes sik luk in fisheing, that thai take nocht sa mony salmon, as we sal say or it be lang, uses to be takine be sum in riveris in the north partes” (*Ibid.*).

¹ Muniments of Irvine, I., p. 68.

² Convention Records, I., pp. 87, 88.

³ Privy Council Register. III, pp. 300-302.

they undertook to be for ever true and faithful servants to the earl and his successors; to serve him at their own expense in all time of war, both at home and abroad; to take part with him against all and sundry, save the King and the Steward of Scotland; to be ready with their whole boats and "vivers," on sufficient warning, to serve his lordship, both in Scotland and Ireland, on his reasonable expenses; to reveal and, if in their power, to stay, whatever they might know as designed for his injury or "skair;" to give him true and "effauld" [honest] counsel in all things shown to them by him. Further, they engaged that at the annual election of bailies and officers the Earl and his heirs for ever should have the nomination and election of one bailie and one officer—these being indwellers in the burgh. This peculiar document was signed at Glasgow, and the common seal of Renfrew appended by the magistrates and town-clerk of the burgh.¹

On 22nd July, 1581, King James VI. granted a charter to the craftsmen of the burghs of Scotland in terms substantially similar to those of the crown charters of 1556 and 1564 already referred to (*antea*, pp. 24, 25).²

On 29th November, 1581, parliament ratified the act 1488, c. 12, with the addition that the ships of all strangers and others coming to the west parts of the realm, and the west and north isles thereof, should come to the king's free burghs, such as Kirkeudbright, Wigton, Ayr, Irvine, Rothesay, Dumbarton, or Renfrew, and there make their merchandise with the free men thereof, of all kinds of goods either brought into the realm or taken forth thereof, and pay their custom and duty thereon. These strangers were prohibited to make any kind of merchandise at the lochs of the west and north isles, or other places not being free burghs, or to buy any merchandise or fish, except salted and barrelled, save at free burghs and from free men. The magistrates and officers of burghs were appointed to apprehend and try contravengers and take up their ships and moveable goods, two parts thereof to go to the King and the third part to the apprehender of the contravengers.³ *

On 19th February, 1584-5, King James VI. granted to the burgh of Rothesay a charter of Confirmation and Novodamus, by which, on a narrative of the charter of 1400-1 by King Robert III., he confirmed the burgh as a free royal burgh, with privilege and liberty of territory and liberties within all its limits therein set forth. He also empowered the Council and community to elect and have annually a provost, bailies, councillors, and officers, with all the powers therein set forth, including a weekly market, two public yearly fairs and markets, one on 22nd July and the other on 23rd October, each to continue for eight days. Further, he granted to the magistrates and inhabitants of the burgh a free port

¹ Municipal Corporation Reports, II., p. 355.

² Great Seal Register, lib. 35, No. 420; printed Register, V., p. 76, No. 233; Convention Records, II., pp. 476-479.

³ 1581, c. 27. Acts of Parliament, III., pp. 224-5.

and harbour for ships in the bay and station of the burgh and Kyles of Bute, the stations of Cumbrey, Fairly, and Holy Isle, and all others within the foresaid bounds, with free entrance and exit for ships and boats for carrying burdens with all kinds of goods and merchandise not prohibited by law, with all privileges and liberties of a free port and receptacle for ships, with power, for the support of the port, to receive and raise off goods, merchandise, ships, and boats, all kinds of lesser customs and other duties received by the magistrates, officers, and customers of any burgh within the kingdom. The annual duty to be paid by the burgh to the Crown was declared to be £6, with the service of burgh used and wont.¹

The privileges conferred by this charter were very valuable, could they have been taken advantage of, but the disturbances of the times operated most unfavourably on the burgh, and its population diminished for a time till after the middle of the 18th century, when it began to recover from its depression, though the rise of Greenock and the development of the other Clyde and Ayrshire ports interfered with what otherwise might have been its valuable trading rights.

The exclusive privileges of royal and free burghs, which were restricted to their resident burgesses, were often encroached upon by burgesses of unfree burghs of regality and barony, and, as has been seen, by persons who exercised the privileges of trade peculiar to royal burghs under the coverture of their privileged burgesses. This and the non-residence of burgesses in their respective burghs was a subject of frequent complaint, and ordinances of Parliament and the Convention of Burghs were directed against it. Of this an act of convention dated 24th April, 1595, may be regarded as an illustration:—
“The quhilk day it was agreeit and concludit be the Commissioners observing the privelege of thair brughs conform to the act maid in the general convention of burrowis haldin last in Stryviling, that the magistrates of ewerie ane of thair touns soll caus all persouns maid burgessis be ony of thair touns that dwellis nocht nor makis actual residence thairinto, and ar traffikqueris as fremen, or hes ony comoun landis within ony of the brughis foirsaid, to be chargit be thair nameis in special, ather personle or at the mercatt croceis respective, vpon ane mercatt day in tyme of mercatt, be thair officeris, to cum and resorte to thair said brugh quhair thai war maid fre, with thair fameleis, and thair to mak actual residence and duelling within the samyn, and to do sic thingis as becumis thame, and underly the chairges of the toun, as other fremen dois, betuixt and the fyftene day of June next, makand publicatioun and certification to them, gif thai failze thairin thair fredomeis salbe cryit doun, and thai fra that day furth to be repute, halden and vsit as vnfremen, and haue no preulege of fredome thairunto. And siclyke the saidis commissioneris hes statute and ordanit that in tyme cuming

¹ Municipal Corporations Commissioners' Report, II., p. 365. The Isle of Bute in the Olden Time. Hewison, II., pp. 191-195. Reid's History of Bute, Appendix, p. 262.

thair sall be na persoun maid freman and burges in any of the saidis touns bot sie as ar actual induelleris, resident within the samyn, and mak securitie for remaning and induelling thairinto, and doing of his dewty of the samyn as becumis ane freman; and incalis he makis nocht residence, to tyne his fredome *ipso facto*, and to be repute vnfre in all respectis fra thene furth. Item, that ewerie ane of thair touns sall, be thair commissioneris, geve up ane report of the haill nameis of all vnfremen that vsis traffik of fremen within thair boundis to the next general assemble of burrowis, that thai may be persewit be the agent thairfoir.”¹

On 4th February, 1580-1, King James VI. issued two precepts under his privy seal, directed to the bailies, burgesses, and communities of Renfrew and Rutherglen, and all others, prohibiting them from troubling any of the lieges coming with goods and merchandise to Glasgow.²

On 29th November, 1581, parliament (1) ratified all acts made by the King and his progenitors “ anent the destruction of cruvis and yairs, slauchter of reid fische, smolts and the fry of all fisches;” and because it was understood that “ albeit panes and travellis wes tane to cast doun and destroy the saidis cruvis and yaris, yet in default of the executioun of the panis contenit in the saidis actis . . . throw the defalt and negligence of the ordinar officiars to quhome the executioun thairof was committit,” the law had not been duly enforced. To remedy this neglect in future justices were nominated for various districts, the magistrates of Glasgow, Renfrew, and Lanark being appointed justices for the Clyde and its tributaries in executing the acts and punishing transgressors; and (2) appointed the commissioners of burghs to convene at such times and in such places as they thought good to treat upon the welfare of merchants, merchandise, good rule, and statutes for the common profit of burghs and anent the privileges of burghs. Such as failed to attend when warned were subject to a fine of £20.³

On 9th March, 1582-3 counter claims between Ayr and Irvine, including part of the extent due by the former burgh for repairing Irvine bridge, having been referred by both burghs to the commissioners of certain other burghs, were fully investigated and considered by them, after which they issued their award, which both burghs had previously agreed to accept without challenge or question.⁴

The position of Dumbarton, on the low ground at the junction of the Leven with the Clyde, exposed it to frequent inundations from both rivers, and the inhabitants appear to have taken action in the latter part of the fifteenth century to protect the town by erecting defensive bulwarks. As its fortunes decayed it seems to have been unable to maintain these works, and, as was usual in those days, it applied to the Convention of Burghs for assistance in the form of pecuniary grants. Thus on 22nd June, 1582, it sought a grant for repairing its “ dekayitt

¹ Convention Records, II., p. 11-12.

² Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 189, No. 71.

³ 1581, c. 15, 26. Acts of Parliament,

III., pp. 217, 224.

⁴ Convention Records, I., pp. 150-2.

havin and stopping the watter ;”¹ but the consideration of its application was postponed at meetings of the Convention in 1583, 1584, and 1593.²

On 9th December, 1583, John earl of Montrose, Sheriff of Dumbarton, bailie of the dukedom of Lennox and earldom of Darnley, and having commandment of the manrent of the inhabitants of the dukedom and earldom and of the barony and city of Glasgow, demitted these honours. Proclamation was accordingly ordered at the market cross of Glasgow, charging the inhabitants of the dukedom, earldom, barony, and city to obey Ludovic, the then duke of Lennox, and his tutor in these offices and manrent, in which the duke was entered.³

On 28th October, 1584, Glasgow and Dumbarton resolved, in accordance with “their last conclusion maid at Kilpatrick,” to take common action against unfree packers and peilers, and to supplicate parliament on the subject.⁴

On 24th September, 1585, the burghs of Ayr, Irvine, and Renfrew represented to the privy council that the captain of the castle of Dumbarton and the bailies of Dumbarton had procured a commission from the King and council constituting them justices to execute certain acts of parliament in regard to packing and peeling herring and white fish taken in Lochlong, Lochgoil, and other lochs, and to bring the fish to Dumbarton to be sold there; that in the exercise of that office they had discharged all markets of such fish to be held, or herring or white fish to be salted, packed, or peeled out of Dumbarton, so far as taken in those lochs and other places mentioned in the commission; that the commission was contrary to all order or justice, and had been granted without parties having been called, or cognition taken. The captain and a commissioner of Dumbarton having appeared before the council, and the complainers having also appeared, and parties having been heard, the commission complained of was held to be passed according to the laws and acts of parliament, and was ordered to stand till orderly discharged.⁵

In 1553, Claud Hamilton—third son of James duke of Chatelherault, then Governor of Scotland, and nephew of John Hamilton, sometime Abbot of Paisley, afterwards Archbishop of St. Andrews and Primate of Scotland—was made Commendator of Paisley, though only nine or ten years of age. After the battle of Langside and the overthrow of Queen Mary, on 13th May, 1568, the archbishop was attainted, and Claud, the commendator, was included in his uncle’s fall. The Regent Moray bestowed the abbey property upon Lord Semple, who had deserted the party of the Queen. But after the assassination of the Regent Moray on 23rd January, 1570, the outlawed archbishop returned to Paisley, took possession of the abbey, and captured and imprisoned Lord Semple. The Regent Lennox, however, attacked the archbishop, who fled to Dumbarton Castle, where he was captured, and was hanged at the market cross of Stirling on 17th April, 1571.

¹ Convention Records, I., p. 134.

² *Ibid.*, I., pp. 180, 415.

³ Privy Council Register, III., p. 614.

⁴ Glasgow Records, I., p. 114.

⁵ Privy Council Register, IV., p. 18.

In July, 1572, the commendator returned to Paisley, and attacked Lord Semple unsuccessfully. Subsequent to the Treaty of Perth, in 1573, his forfeiture was recalled, Lord Semple was driven out of the abbey by the Earl of Argyle in name of the King, and Claud was reinstated.¹ But his possession was comparatively short lived. Through the influence of the Regent Morton, it is said, he was again declared traitor; the abbey was besieged, and surrendered in 1579. The commendator had, however, disappeared. From that time till 1584 the abbey and its lands were held by various persons. But in that year Lord Claud, with the King's permission, returned to Scotland, and soon rose high in the royal favour, and on 31st May, 1586, the King, by a Letter of Gift, granted to his son, also named Claud, the benefice of Paisley, reserving the father's liferent.² This letter was ratified by Parliament in the following year.³ On 29th July, 1587—the morning of the day on which Parliament annexed the Church lands to the Crown—Lord Claud obtained a royal charter under which he, his heirs, and successors were vested in the ancient properties of the abbey, with certain specified exceptions, the temporalities of the abbey were erected into a temporal lordship, and he was made a lord of Parliament with the title of Lord Paisley.⁴

On 29th July, 1587, parliament—

(1) Annexed to the Crown the whole temporal lands, offices and regalities of all prelacies and benefices within the kingdom (with certain specified exceptions), and provided for these being let in feu farm. These exceptions included (1) the principal castles, fortalices, houses and mansions of archbishops, bishops, &c., which were appointed to remain with them and their successors for their residence, notwithstanding the annexation; (2) all lands, profits, annualrents, and commodities, previously granted to hospitals or maisondieus within Scotland or for the poor; and (3) all pensions granted out of the annexed lands, either by prelates and ecclesiastical persons or by the King. Further, the act declared (*a*) that all burghs of regality and barony should retain the same freedom and liberty as they possessed before the annexation, but should be held in future of the King, in the same manner and subject to the same condition as they had formerly been held of their ecclesiastical superiors; and (*b*) that where, in lands, baronies, and regalities which previously belonged to archbishops, bishops, &c., heritable bailies and stewards existed, such offices should continue to be held as heretofore, but only of the King as superior.⁵

¹ Hist. MSS. Commissioners' Report (Duke of Argyll), IV., p. 488, No. 287.

² Great Seal Register, V., p. 326, No. 995.

³ 1587, c. 80. Acts of Parliament, III., p. 482.

⁴ Great Seal Register, V., p. 451, No. 1320. Charters of Paisley (Metcalfe), pp. 66-86. Writing in 1578, Bishop Leslie refers to Paisley as "situat amang enowis [hillocks], grene woodis, schawis, and Forrest fair, on the river of Carroun [Cart]; quhair is an ornate brig of eistlare wark and weill decored, be quhilke surelic is past ouer till a magnifik and a rich monaster thair of the same name erected at the tounne syde" (Scotland before 1700, p. 119).

⁵ 1587, c. 8, Acts of Parliament, vol. III., p. 431. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., pp. 192-207, No. 74. While this act annexed the temporalities of benefices to the crown, and empowered it to

(2) Enacted that it should not be lawful to any free burgh to sell or alienate its freedom and privilege in whole or in part to any other burgh or otherwise, without express license and consent of the King and three estates in parliament, under pain of loss of the freedom of the burgh both buying and selling the freedoms in whole or in part.¹

On the same day an act referring to the necessity for altering the tax on the clergy and increasing that on the temporal lands annexed to the Crown ordained that the taxation of the free burghs should remain as heretofore, viz., one-sixth part of all general taxations.²

On the same day also an act of parliament appointed three commissioners to proceed to Irvine and report to the privy council as to the harbour of Irvine, whether it could be helped and "quhat sums and moyen wald help the samyn." If their report was favourable, the council were empowered to grant a reasonable taxation upon such part of the country as they thought proper for the help and support of the harbour.³

Thereafter King James, by charter dated 3rd November, 1587, granted the lands and barony of Glasgow, and other lands and duties, with all right, title, claim of right, customs, duties, and all other privileges whatsoever which belonged to the archbishop of Glasgow in any time bygone, to Walter, commendator of Blantyre, for payment annually of £500, at two terms, Whitsunday and Martinmas, by equal portions, in name of feu-farm, and doubling that payment the first year of the entry of the heirs or assignees of the commendator. But the commendator was authorised to retain, out of the first and readiest revenues specified, £200 yearly of fee for exercising the offices of bailiary and justiciary, and was empowered to set in feu-farm the lands and baronies conveyed to him, or any part thereof, to the ancient and native tenants, to be held of him and his successors in the lordship.⁴

feu the lands, the crown was not restrained from making new erections of temporal lordships and baronies. A ratification by Parliament evaded the act of annexation. So, when Episcopacy was restored in 1606, a valuable part of what had previously been kirk livings was otherwise applied.

¹ 1587, c. 114. Acts of Parliament, III., p. 506.

² 1587, c. 109. Acts of Parliament, III., p. 109. It was because of this burden, says Sir George Mackenzie, that these burghs had the exclusive privilege of trading which could not be communicable to burghs of barony and regality, who bore no part of this burden (Works, I., p. 317).

³ 1587, c. 131, *Ibid.*, III., p. 520. This commission was not executed, however, and a new commission was issued in 1590.

⁴ Glasgow Charters, vol. I., ii., p. 215, No. 78.

This charter was confirmed by the King, after he had attained majority, by a charter dated 26th August, 1591. *Ibid.*, I., ii., 227, No. 80. On 5th October, 1585, Robert, bishop of Glasgow, nominated Sir William Livingston of Kilsyth, knight, to be provost for the following year. The records from 27th April, 1586, to 22nd October, 1588, are awanting. But on 30th

On 5th May, 1586, Irvine applied to the convention of burghs for assistance in repairing its "haven and decayed bridge."¹ On 6th July, 1588, that application was again before the convention,² and on 12th April, 1589, it authorised the burgh to apply to the King for his authority to levy an additional impost for five years on articles, persons, and animals specified entering the burgh—the proceeds to be applied towards the "beitting and mending" of the decayed bridge.³ On 12th June, 1590, the convention found that Irvine had incurred an unlaw of £20 for not reporting its diligence in applying the duties for the upholding of its decayed bridge. It was accordingly ordered to account therefor at the next convention, failing which the duties were to expire and be discharged.⁴

The frequently recurring disputes between Dumbarton and Glasgow as to merchandise arriving in the river Clyde led, on 9th October, 1590, to an agreement being entered into by the magistrates of both towns. The document embodying this agreement declared that when ships or vessels of any kind arrived with merchandise in the river, the bailies of Dumbarton should immediately warn the magistrates and community of Glasgow of whatsoever merchandise was in these vessels, whereupon certain Glasgow merchants should repair to Dumbarton, "to commune and advise of the said merchandise and the availls of the samyne." Merchants should then be chosen by Dumbarton to meet with those of Glasgow and arrange as to the merchandise being bought for "the common welfare and avail of Glasgow and Dumbarton," and should arrange equally as to all profits, and as to the payments for the merchandise, which should be equally divided between the two towns. And for the unity and concord to be kept thereafter between them, the magistrates and community of each burgh engaged to help, supply, and defend each other anent their respective rights and freedoms, and, if needful, to cause persons of each burgh, at equal expense, to defend their privileges and freedoms before the King and his council, and in other places within the realm. If, moreover, any discord or controversy should arise between the burghs as to the buying or paying of the merchandise, or the breaking of the privileges or freedoms of either, six discreet persons of each burgh should meet at Renfrew to reform the faults and punish the breakers and discord makers. Each burgh also

September, 1589, Walter, commendator of Blantyre, in the exercise of the power conferred on him by the charter of 3rd November, 1587, nominated Sir Mathew Stewart of Mynto, knight, to be provost for the following year. The records from 31st July, 1590, to 5th October, 1594, are awanting, but on the last date, and again on 3rd October, 1595, he reappointed Stewart as provost. Previous to the election on 5th October, 1596, the King had transferred this power to the duke of Lennox, who on that day nominated Sir Mathew Stewart. The records from 29th May, 1597, to 21st November, 1598, are awanting, but on 5th October, 1599, Sir Mathew was again elected on the nomination of the duke. On 30th September, 1600, the duke nominated Sir George Elphinstone to be provost, and renominated him on 6th October, 1601. The records from 27th October, 1601, to 13th June, 1605, are awanting.

¹ Convention Records, I., p. 216.

² *Ibid.*, I., p. 292.

³ *Ibid.*, I., pp. 300, 302.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I., p. 329.

became bound to observe the agreement, under a penalty of £100 “of uswall monye of Scotland rinand for the tyme”—of which £40 should be payable to the King, £20 to the kirk work of the Laigh Kirk of Glasgow, and £40 to the community which did not break the agreement.¹ Renfrew, apparently, had no part in this arrangement, and being so uninterested, it was selected as the place of common negotiation.

On 18th June, 1591, the Commissioner of Forfar complained to the Convention against Dundee for uplifting from Forfar a “ladleful” of every load of victual brought by it into Dundee market.² The matter was continued till the Convention on 14th June, 1592, when it was remitted to a committee of Commissioners,³ but nothing further appears in these records in regard to the matter. At the same Convention, on the following day, Lanark complained against Glasgow for taking from it a similar exaction, and a “neif full” of every weight of wool or a fleece of the pack.⁴ The complaint was continued till the next Convention,⁵ when, parties having been heard, the levying of the impost on wool was ordered to be stopped, and the complaint as to the ladleful was continued.⁶ At the Convention on 28th June, 1594, the Commissioner for Glasgow produced a decree of the Court of Session finding the burgh entitled to uplift the ladleful, and the question as to the “neiffull” was continued for probation.⁶

On 5th June, 1592, an act of parliament ratified all acts, rights, privileges, ordinances, and constitutions made for the maintenance of the liberties of free burghs. Further, inasmuch as by divers acts of parliament it was ordained that none save burgesses of free burghs should exercise the traffic of merchandise, but that these enactments had not been observed by reason that no penalty was attached to the contravengers, it was enacted that whosoever, not being a free burgess, should exercise the traffic of merchandise should escheat his whole goods and gear, one half to the King and the other half to the common good of the burgh whose officer should first apprehend the same. All free burghs were accordingly empowered to search for the goods and gear of such unfreemen traffickers, and to intromit therewith as

¹ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 225, No. 79. On 27th April, 1591, Robert Bowes, writing to Lord Burghley, refers to the “anxiety of the town of Glasgow for the preservation of their trade” (Calendar of State Papers (Scotland), p. 591).

² Convention Records, I., 357.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I., 381.

³ *Ibid.*, I., 377.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I., 398.

⁶ Convention Records, I., 433. The document thus produced appears to be the decree by the Court of Session dated 4th June, 1575, whereby it was found that the burgh of Glasgow was entitled to take from each sack of victual coming to the market a ladleful, being about the fourth part of a peck (Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 164, No. 65). For some time before 1846, when the petty customs of Glasgow were commuted into a lump payment from the police rates, the “ladleful” had been converted into a money payment. The *ladle* was a duty imposed on grain or meal brought into the market for sale. (See also remarks as to ladle duty, and the practice of passing money by means of a ladle in times of pestilence, in Ure’s History of Rutherglen (1790), pp. 46-7.)

escheat, whether such goods and gear were in the realm or in any other part where the same might be challenged. From the operation of this act, however, noblemen, barons, and other landed men were exempt, and they might cause merchandise to be brought for their own particular use and behoof, provided they did not sell or make merchandise of it.¹ On the same day another act was passed prohibiting craftsmen from exercising their crafts in the suburbs of free burghs.²

On the 15th of the same month Glasgow, in concert with Dumbarton, Irvine, and Ayr, complained to the convention against Kirkeudbright for levying an impost of salt from every vessel which arrived in its harbour, and all the parties were ordered, under a penalty of £20, to appear at the next convention;³ on the 17th Glasgow also complained against Ayr, that it took up greater duties for the upholding of their bridge than they were authorised by their gift to uplift.⁴ On the same day Ayr, Irvine, Glasgow, and Dumbarton were ordered to apprehend the burgesses of Rothesay, their goods and gear, for payment of the arrears of their extents and unlaws, complaint being made that they neither paid them nor kept conventions, as other burghs did.⁵

About this time Dumbarton lost nearly sixty acres of its land through the flooding of the Leven. By this and other losses, and by a decay which had fallen upon a large number of other Scottish burghs, Dumbarton was reduced to such straits as to compel it to renew its application to the convention of burghs for assistance in repairing its "haven and in stopping the water thereof." The convention, therefore, on 14th June, 1592, remitted to it a penalty of £20 which it

¹ 1592, c. 74. *Acts of Parliament*, III., p. 578.

² *Ibid.*, c. 76. *Ibid.*, p. 579. Two other acts passed at this time may be noticed, by one of which it was declared that the temporality of Paisley had been and was excepted from the act of annexation, and was validly conveyed to Claud Lord Paisley and his heirs male and assignees (*Ibid.*, c. 102, pp. 594-5); and by the other, authority was given to John Shaw of Greenock to build a kirk, manse, and yard, on any part of his lands, to be called the parish kirk of Greenock, and the several privileges therein set forth were confirmed to him (*Ibid.*, c. 21, pp. 549-51).

³ Convention Records, I., pp. 380, 397, 434, 455, 484. This complaint formed the subject of proof and discussion by successive conventions till 3rd July, 1596, when the subject appears to have been dropped.

⁴ Convention Records, I., pp. 390, 399.

⁵ Convention Records, I., p. 390. On 2nd July, 1594, the commissioner for Rothesay found caution to pay the arrears of taxations, customs, and extents due by the burgh previous to the following "Andermes" (30th November- *Ibid.*, p. 439).

On 2nd July, 1594, the Convention of Burghs exempted, for three years from all general conventions, Rutherglen, Renfrew, and Rothesay, provided that they sent to each convention with the commissioner of the next burgh an authentic letter of ratification of all things done in these conventions, with all sums due to the convention for the time for clerk's fees, agent's fees, or other cause, failing which these burghs were to be unlawed (*Ibid.*, p. 439). A similar exemption for three years was granted to Rothesay, Irvine, Rutherglen, and Dumbarton on 14th June, 1600 (*Ibid.*, pp. 78, 79).

had incurred by its absence from the convention held at Montrose in June, 1591, ordering the money to be employed in repairing the “ruinous toun,” and to be accounted for at the next general convention.¹ On 15th June, 1593, it continued its application for assistance, and a similar one from Renfrew, till next convention, and resolved to give in an article to the next parliament, craving the support of the whole realm to Dumbarton, Renfrew, and other decayed burghs.² It does not appear, however, that anything followed on that resolution.

Previous to 1593 important changes had taken place in regard to the archbishopric, his rights to which the commendator of Blantyre had resigned. Ludovic duke of Lennox was at that time in high favour with the King, who, on 21st July of that year, under the authority of an act of Parliament, granted to the duke for his lifetime the right of superiority of the whole temporal lands of the archbishopric, with power to receive resignations and grant entries to vassals, free tenants, and heritable feuars.³

In 1593 the convention further considered the complaint of Glasgow against Ayr for uplifting greater dues for the upholding of its bridge than it was entitled to under its gift. This complaint formed the subject of somewhat acrimonious discussion, and, in consequence of the commissioner for Ayr refusing to give effect to the orders of the convention, it suspended all warrants which that burgh could pretend to have from it, and ordered the agents to concur with Glasgow in obtaining suspension of the gift and annulment by the next parliament.⁴ Kirkcudbright having failed in 1593 to appear, in terms of the order of the previous year, was fined in another unlaw of £20, to be uplifted by the agent, and the former order was renewed.⁵ This matter was brought before the convention at its meetings in 1594 and 1596, but was still left undecided, and then disappears from the record.

At the convention on 1st July, 1594, Dumbarton, on the ground of poverty, obtained exemption from attendance at conventions for three years; but, notwithstanding the agreement entered into with Glasgow four years previously, it preferred a complaint against that burgh for receiving unfreemen and regrating, and allowing them to trade within the burgh to the hurt of its privileges.⁶ On the 3rd of July, again, the convention had before it, and continued, a supplication from Dumbarton for an impost on strangers coming by boat with goods.⁷

On the 21st of June, 1593, Glasgow and Renfrew complained to the privy council against George Smollett, burgess of Dumbarton, that he had purchased from the King a privy letter or commission, without the advice of the privy council, and that under it he had associated with him “certain deboshit men and

¹ Convention Records, I., p. 376.

⁴ Convention Records, I., p. 400.

² *Ibid.*, I., p. 415.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I., 397, pp. 434, 484.

³ Glasgow Charters, vol. I., ii., p. 454.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I., p. 437.

1593, c. 55. Acts of Parliament, IV.,

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 448.

p. 38.

vagabonds," who oppressed and sometimes imprisoned the persons of the inhabitants of the Highlands and islands, and seized the goods, gear, and bestial which they brought by sea and land to the burghs of the complainers. The effect of this action, it was said, was to inspire the chief persons and other inhabitants of the Highlands and islands with feelings of hatred and malice towards the complainers, as if they were to blame. Smollett, however, failed to appear and answer to the complaint, whereupon the King and council discharged his commission, and ordained him to be denounced rebel.¹

On 2nd January, 1595-6, King James—on the narrative that the rights to the archbishopric held by the commendator and the duke of Lennox had been resigned into his hands—confirmed various charters and feu rights which had been granted by the commendator to a number of vassals.²

On 1st July, 1595, the convention of burghs ordered a missive to be sent to the magistrates of Glasgow stating that the burghs were not a little offended that Glasgow did not conform to the comely order of the other free burghs in having a dean of guild and electing guild brethren, and desiring it to send two commissioners for the merchants, and two for the craftsmen, to Edinburgh on 1st August, to meet the commissioners of the burghs to reason and confer with them on the subject.³ On 2nd July, 1596, the convention found that Glasgow had not obeyed the act of the previous year in any point, and ordered a missive to be sent to it requiring two merchants and two craftsmen to meet the commissioners at Edinburgh on the 20th of that month, to confer, reason, and entreat on the matter, and hear and see an order of guildry established in Glasgow, or else to allege a reasonable cause in the contrary, under pain of £100.⁴ On 21st July, accordingly, a merchant and deacon of craft of Glasgow, commissioned by the magistrates and town-clerk of the burgh, appeared and represented that the proposal was a great novelty, and threatened to cause dissension, and was such, moreover, as they thought no one might impose on them save the King, and with their consent. As yet they had not resolved on their action, and therefore they desired that matters should remain till a decision had been come to. The commissioners of the convention offered to give the representatives of Glasgow a draft of the form of guildry used in Edinburgh. This was accepted, and the matter was continued till the next convention.⁵ At its meeting, on 5th July, 1597, the subject was continued till the following convention,⁶ and at its meeting in Glasgow on 3rd July, 1598, after private and public conference with the merchants and craftsmen, it was found that an agreement could not be come to. It was therefore determined to depart from the subject till it was wakened, and sought of new with the consent of the whole burgh.⁷

¹ Privy Council Register, V., p. 87.

² Privy Seal Register, vol. lxviii., fol. 133.

³ Convention Records, I., pp. 469-470.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I., p. 479.

⁵ Convention Records, I., pp. 495-496.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II., p. 6.

⁷ *Ibid.* II., pp. 27, 28.

On 3rd July, 1596, the convention remitted to six burghs to confer with the King and the privy council as to sending to France to renew the league with it on the basis of the ancient liberties of the merchant estate.¹ But on the 15th of that month the commissioners of the six burghs found it good to show to the King and privy council that the time was not proper for that purpose, by reason of the King of France not being established in his crown, nor being at peace either with his subjects or his neighbours.²

On 8th July, 1596, King James confirmed, under his great seal, the decree obtained by Glasgow against the inhabitants of Rutherglen and Renfrew, of date 10th June, 1542. This confirmation would scarcely have been necessary if the claims and exactions of these burghs had not rendered a fresh appeal to the Sovereign necessary.³

In ancient times the shipping of Irvine appears to have come close up to the Seagate Castle, but from the accumulation of sandbanks brought up by high winds and heavy seas the old arrangements underwent many and complete changes, affecting not only the position of the port and estuary of the rivers Irvine and Garnock, but, judging from the old maps, even the whole line of coast between Irvine and Saltcoats. Notwithstanding that the burgh had acquired part of the lands of Marres, farther down the river, "for lowsing and laidnyng their schippis, boittis and merchandice,"⁴ so unsatisfactory did the burgesses consider the harbour accommodation that on their application a commission to enquire and report as to its condition was appointed by parliament in July, 1587.⁵ It was not executed, however, two of the commissioners having died, and it became necessary to have others appointed. The King therefore, on the petition of the provost and magistrates of the burgh, on 22nd July, 1590, empowered Thomas Lord Boyd, master of Eglinton; Blair of Blair; and Hew Campbell of Terrinyeane, or any two of them, to visit and consider the water mouth, haven, port, and harboury, and "see gif the same may be helpit," and for that purpose to "confer with the maist honest and ancient burgessis of the burgh and landit gentlemen dweland next adjacent thereto," and what sums of money would help the same, and "gif the same can not be helpit, to visit sum uther commodious place nixt adjacent to the said burgh quhair an herbry may be biggit, and to set down an overtour how the same may be biggit, and quhat expenssis wilbe requisite," reporting to the King and council by the Feast of Pasch next.⁶ On 3rd July, 1594, the convention of burghs had under consideration a supplication by Irvine "for support to the buying and bigging of ane harbery," and it was ordered to be remembered in the next missives.⁷ But at that convention on 28th June, 1595, the harbour does not appear to have been dealt with. Authority was, however,

¹ Convention Records, p. 482.

⁵ 1587, c. 131. Acts of Parliament, III.,

² *Ibid.*, pp. 493, 498.

p. 520.

³ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 247, No. 84.

⁶ Privy Council Register, IV., pp. 511-2.

⁴ Muniments of Irvine, I., p. 62.

⁷ Convention Records, I., 448.

given to the burgh to impetrare from the King an impost for seven years, to be applied in repairing the bridge, and the commissioner for the burgh renounced and cancelled the old gift previously purchased without consent of the burghs.¹

In June, 1596, the magistrates presented to the priyy council a suppli-cation, in which they represented that the "water mouth" had become so filled with sand as to be unremediable, and that, in consequence, many of their neighbours had sustained great loss and shipwreck, and the town had been impoverished. They had, in consequence, considered where a harbour could most commodiously be provided, and had found no place so fit as a creek in Little Comray—which, however, they were unable of themselves to provide. They therefore craved commission to be granted to Walter Prior of Blantyre, treasurer, and four others, to enquire and report on the matter. Commission was accordingly granted by the privy council, on 3rd June, 1596, to these persons to visit the creek and consider its suitability, and also to confer with persons of experience as to the cost of forming a suitable harbour, and to report before 1st November, so that the privy council might, under powers granted by parliament, authorise the necessary taxation. These commissioners, in July, reported in favour of the proposed site, and estimated the cost at £4,773 6s. 8d., whereupon the King and council, on 29th July, 1596, granted to the burgh, for five years, an impost on all merchandise entering or leaving the ports of Ayr, Glasgow, and Dumbarton, or passing up and down the river and to or from the highlands and lowlands. Should, however, the inhabitants of the several burghs consider themselves aggrieved, their complaint would be considered, and dealt with according to justice.²

On 2nd July, 1596, the convention of burghs, having under consideration former acts concerning unfree traffickers and crafts in suburbs and outland burghesses, found that the acts of parliament, laws, and privileges of burghs in regard to the same, and to forestallers, regraters, and coupers (dealers), were not put to such speedy and sharp execution as the necessity of the case requires, whereby the multitude of unfreemen coupers and forestallers of all sorts of merchandise within the realm is greatly increasing, so that in process of time all country wares will fall into unfreemen's hands, to be used at their pleasure. Every burgh was, therefore, ordered to put the acts of parliament, statutes, and privileges of burghs to speedy and sharp execution, and to report its diligence to the next convention.³

The exercise of merchandise by unfreemen, under the coverture of free-men in Scotland, was, as has been seen, sternly prohibited. It was also prohibited by the convention of burghs in those foreign countries with which Scotland traded under treaty and conservatorial protection. So on 7th July, 1597, the Conservator in the Low Countries was ordered to report to the magistrates of each burgh the

¹ Convention Records, I., 461.

² Privy Council Register, V., pp. 293, 305. Muniments of Irvine, I., pp. 77, 84, 85.

³ Convention Records, I., p. 476.

names of the unfreemen who had come, or might afterwards come, from it to practice merchandise there. And on such report being received, the burgh receiving it was required to punish the offender and report its action to the next convention, under a penalty of £40 Scots.¹

In 1597 the citizens of Glasgow possessed several small vessels engaged in carrying wine, probably from France, and other commodities, including timber, from the Highlands. Reference is made to six, with a tonnage of 23, 21½, 50, 43, 50, and 92 tons respectively, or 279½ tons in all. Besides these, four are referred to as trading with the burgh—two belonging to Pittenweem in Fife, of 60 and 48 tons respectively; one to Aberdeen, of 38 tons; and one to Dundee, of 65 tons, or 211 tons in all.² The cargoes of such of these vessels as could not get up the river beyond Dumbarton or Dumbuck ford were probably transferred to boats, and taken up to the Broomielaw, on the north bank of the Clyde, where the boat traffic of the city seems to have been then accommodated on a common where a market was held. But on 6th August, 1596, the magistrates and council ordered the river sergeant to charge all the boats which frequented the Broomielaw to go up to the bridge of Glasgow, and there make their market. He was also ordered to prohibit the holding of any market at the Broomielaw under a penalty of £10.³ Transferred to the bridge, as is observed by Mr. Renwick, the market was within easier reach of the townsfolk, and probably better subject to the control of the magistrates, especially with regard to the collection of custom duties. Goods thus brought to the city were liable for dues according to a tariff known as the A, B, C, and the right to levy these dues was let to a tacksman.⁴

The old bridge over the Cart at Paisley having become ruinous, King James, on 16th January, 1598-9, granted the town a charter authorising the levy of a custom on specified animals passing it for a period of nineteen years.⁵

By an act of the convention of estates, held on 29th June, 1598, James archbishop of Glasgow was restored to his honours, dignities, and benefices, in consideration of his services abroad to Queen Mary and to King James, and this notwithstanding all acts for his forfeiture, and of his not having made confession of his faith or acknowledged the reformed religion.⁶

¹ Convention Records, II., p. 8.

² Glasgow Records, I., 187.

³ Protocols of the Town Clerks of Glasgow, edited by Robert Renwick, No. 2886, Footnote 2. See footnote, 14th October, 1609, *postea*, p. 63.

⁴ Glasgow Records, I., pp. 221, 222.

⁵ Charters of Paisley (Metcalfe), p. 87. Brown's History of Paisley, I., p. 176. Authority to levy this custom seems to have been continued by the Privy Council for a long time afterwards.

The population of Paisley about this time is said to have been about 800 (Brown's History, I., p. 364).

⁶ 1598, c. 14. Acts of Parliament, IV., 169, 170. Privy Council Register, V., 464.

In the Calendar of the Cecil Papers references are made to the fact that about this time the archbishop was employed in France by the King (Historical MSS. Commission, part 8, pp. 322, 330, 331, 352, 529). The archbishop is referred to in these papers under the pseudonym of "Cato" and "Coelo" (*Ibid.*, 180, 181, 182, 329).

Further information as to the early shipping trade of the Clyde is afforded by a book in the office of the town-clerk of Dumbarton which records the entry of vessels into the river between 20th March, 1595 and 1657. The book begins with the entry by John Smollett, younger, burgess of Dumbarton, of his ship, called "The Providence of Dumbarton," which had then come into the Clyde at Newark, laden with 50 tuns of high country wines, shipped at Bordeaux. In 1596, eight entries of ships which had arrived at Inchgreen are recorded, and one at Pot of the Rig. The importations are 325 tuns of wine, chiefly high country, shipped at Bordeaux or Rochelle. The greatest quantity imported in one ship is 50 tuns, the least $5\frac{1}{2}$ tuns. It appears, however, that some of the vessels went from port to port, landing portions of their cargoes at each. In 1597 nine ships are entered, laden in most cases with salt, and one or two with iron and tar. In 1598 eleven vessels are entered laden with wood in deals and spars, and nine with salt.¹

On 4th July, 1598, Glasgow presented a supplication to the convention lamenting the danger of its bridge, the sanding of the river, and the destruction of its green, and the want of causeways and bridges, to the apparent decay of the city, and seeking license to obtain a reasonable impost for the reparation of these matters. The convention thereupon authorised the burgh to impetrare a gift from the King to levy an impost on the several articles specified, for nine years from the passing of the gift as regarded certain articles, and for three years as regarded others. At the termination of these years Glasgow had to report the receipt and employment of the impost to the convention, and not to uplift it afterwards without its sanction, under a penalty of £40. Against this grant, so far as regarded the impost to be levied from freemen, Renfrew dissented.²

On the same day Dumbarton again applied to the convention of burghs to aid it in "keiping of thair toun and herberie fra wesching away be the sey and watter;"³ and on 6th July, 1599, was empowered to obtain from the King a gift of an impost, for nine years, on certain articles entering the burgh, to be applied in the repair of the harbour, and to be accounted for to the convention.⁴ At the same time Renfrew—which on 15th June, 1593, had craved the support of the convention "to the reparation of its harbour"⁵—was authorised to apply for a gift of an impost for five years.⁶ On the previous day the convention, in consideration of the poor and decayed estate of Rutherglen granted it a taxation of £100, to be paid by each burgh according to the tax roll,⁷ and to be employed

¹ Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 166.

² Convention Records, II., 34.

As indicating the relative financial positions of the burghs in 1597, the general Extent Roil of the burghs shows the following to have been the percentage of taxation (Scots money):—Edinburgh, £23 15s.; Dundee, £10 15s.; Perth, £6 3s. 4d.; Aberdeen, £8; Glasgow, £4 10s.; while Irvine was 24s.; Renfrew, 12s.; Rothesay, 4s.; Rutherglen, 4s.; and Dumbarton, 22s. (*Ibid.*, p. 10).

³ Convention Records, II., p. 36.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II., p. 56.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I., p. 415.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II., p. 55.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II., p. 49.

in repairing its tolbooth and causeways. This grant may have proceeded on the report of Glasgow, which had been ordered to send four men to inspect the condition of the town and its common rent and to report.¹

On 15th December, 1599, Glasgow agreed to make common cause with its merchants and others, having salmon to transport to France and other places, in resisting an unprecedented claim by the captain of Dumbarton (Castle) to levy an impost of £20 Scots on each last exported. A magistrate was accordingly appointed to ride to Edinburgh with one of the merchants, and represent the matter to the government.²

In April, 1600, a license under the signet was granted by the King and the privy council to Glasgow to levy an impost or toll for a period of nineteen years —one half of the proceeds to be applied in repairing and upholding the cathedral, and the other half in repairing and upholding the bridge, removing the sand from the water, mending and building the calsays, and helping the green, with power to distrain for these tolls. This license proceeded on a narrative of the lamentable estate of the cathedral kirk, and of the bridge, "now become ruinous," and in sundry parts greatly decayed, some of the chief pillars and under props being shaken and made altogether loose through great storms and inundations of waters, which, chiefly in the winter season, had often followed, the waters in sundry parts about the bridge being also sanded, and the green near thereto almost destroyed and worn in sundry parts.³

On 31st May, 1600, two inhabitants of Saltcoats, whose sails and boat gear the customs tacksmen had seized at the Broomielaw, objected to the jurisdiction of the provost and bailies; and at the request of those magistrates the customers restored the boat gear to the objectors, on their finding caution to appear before competent judges.⁴

The impost obtained by Glasgow in April seems to have enabled it to proceed with works for the improvement of the channel of the Clyde. On 28th May, 1600, the master of works was ordered to begin "the casting of the water" (*i.e.*, the clearing of the channel) on the following Tuesday;⁵ on the 24th of June four men were ordered to be employed weekly on the same work on the town's charges;⁶ and on the 19th of July one Smyth, an Englishman, was consulted as to the cleaning of the river and the repairing of the fords and sanded places.⁷

What was done by the burgh of Irvine with the proceeds of the impost authorised on 29th July, 1596, does not appear; but on 16th June, 1600, the convention of burghs granted to Ayr and Irvine an impost for five years on coal transported within their liberties, to be applied in repairing their harbours.⁸

¹ Convention Records, II., p. 37.

² Glasgow Records, I., p. 200.

³ Privy Council Register, XIV., 387, 388. Of that license proclamation was ordered to be made at the market cross of Glasgow. See also Glasgow Records, I., pp. 206-7.

⁴ Glasgow Records, I., p. 209.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I., p. 208.

⁷ Glasgow Records, I., p. 209.

⁸ Convention Records, II., p. 86. On 11th November, 1600, the commissioner for Irvine

On 19th June, 1600, the convention empowered Dumbarton to apply for a separate impost for seven years, to be employed for "preservation of the burgh fra inundatioun and destruccioun be the riveris"—the proceeds to be accounted for to the convention at the expiry of the licence.¹ Under the liberty thus given, Dumbarton applied to the King. With a view, apparently, to the effecting of an amicable arrangement with that burgh, Glasgow, on 26th August, appointed four commissioners to ride to the "Bornes" to meet it, and endeavour to come to terms, by proposing that the river Clyde should be free, as of old. This offer appears, however, to have been declined, whereupon, on 6th September, Glasgow resolved to oppose the impost consented to by the convention on 6th July, 1599. It was accordingly summoned to appear before the King and council at Stirling on 9th September, to be heard for its interest in the matter, and was represented by the provost, two bailies and twelve "honest men of the town."² Representatives of Dumbarton and Glasgow, and also of Renfrew, accordingly appeared at Stirling on 10th September, 1600, and were heard by the King and the privy council, who ordered the gift sought to be expedie, without prejudice to the liberty of the water of Clyde, claimed by Glasgow and Renfrew, the trial whereof, with the explanation of the act of the burghs as to the liberties of Dumbarton, was remitted to the convention. But till its decision was given, Dumbarton was prohibited from uplifting the impost within the bounds of the Clyde.³ Under this remit the subject was considered by the convention on 7th November, when representatives of Glasgow, Renfrew, and Dumbarton, attended and were heard, but the commissioners were not able to explain the liberties of the burghs without farther cognition. As regarded the impost, however, they declared that it should be uplifted in the water of Leven only, "without prejudice to the liberties of the saidis three burghis, or ony of thame, which they had or might pretend to have upone the river befoir the granting of the impost."⁴

On 15th November, 1600, an act of parliament ratified to James, archbishop of Glasgow, his restitution by the Convention of Estates, on 29th June, 1598, to his whole heritages and possessions, but without prejudice to feus of the temporal lands lawfully set and to the ministers' stipends. From the restitution were also excepted his right to the castle of Glasgow, to choose the provost and bailies of the burgh, and the provostry and bailyary thereof.⁵ On the 17th of the same appeared before the Commissioners of Convention, and, in name of that burgh, promised that whatever sums of money were granted to it by taxation or impost thereafter, either at parliament, convention of estates, or privy council, for the repair of its harbour should not be uplifted from any of the burghs or their liberties without their consent (*Ibid.*, p. 96).

¹ Convention Records, II., pp. 90-91. From this resolution the commissioner of Glasgow dissented, and took instruments (see Glasgow Records, I., p. 210).

² Glasgow Records, I., p. 212.

³ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 248, No. 85. Privy Council Register, VI., pp. 160-161.

⁴ Convention Records, II., pp. 94-95.

⁵ 1600, c. 57. Acts of Parliament, IV., p. 256.

month King James granted a charter to Ludovic duke of Lennox of the castle, with its surroundings, and the right to elect the magistrates of the city.¹

On 1st May, 1601, King James granted to the burgh of Irvine a charter by which he confirmed all its charters, rights, and privileges, and of new granted the burgh, with its several rights and privileges, fishings, seaport, harbour, customs, anchorages, freedom of trade, three free fairs annually, and two weekly markets.²

On 25th June, 1601; for keeping of better amity and friendship with Dumbarton in future, Glasgow proposed to remit its freemen resorting to the city of their customs, provided Dumbarton remitted the burgesses and indwellers of the city of their customs.³

That the river traffic in the beginning of the seventeenth century was not of large amount can scarcely be doubted, but, such as it was, it appears to have induced the town council, on 6th June, 1601, to build a little custom-house upon the end of the bridge. In it the tacksman of the customs appears to have had his office, and the town officers were ordered to assist him in collecting the dues, the table of which, already referred to and known as the "A.B.C." was affixed to the side of the house.⁴ That this work was carried on with due regard to economy is evidenced by the fact that on 18th July the timber and deals of the Kirk port and Rattanrow port were ordered to be taken down and applied to the making of the little house on the Bridge-end.⁵

On 7th July, 1602, Glasgow and Renfrew, for themselves and on behalf of Dumbarton, complained to the convention against Ayr and Irvine for allowing fishers within their waters to fish with "sandeill pokis,"⁶ to the great destruction of the herring fry, and to the prejudice of the herring fishing, and so prejudicial to the whole estate of merchandise, and also for allowing these fishers to take the fry of the herring and sell the same in their markets. The convention ordered these practices to be discontinued.⁷

Notwithstanding the operations of Glasgow in clearing the channel of the river, commenced in June, 1600, the Clyde, two years afterwards, was such that Ayr complained of its condition to the convention of burghs, and that body ordered Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Renfrew to see that the river and all parts of it near

¹ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 252, No. 87.

A census of Glasgow taken in 1600 showed the population to be then 7,000.

² Great Seal Register, VI., p. 407, No. 1171. Ratified on 17th November, 1641. Acts of Parliament, V., p. 568. Muniments of Irvine, I., pp. 86-91. Dumfries and Irvine having eraved the support of the convention on 14th June, 1600, to "thair deeyait brughis" through the pest and sudden fire (Convention Records, II., p. 76), the convention, on 30th June, 1601, found "in respect of the universal decay and poverty of the haill burrowis" that they could not aid these two burghs at that time by a taxation, but they remitted them to the charitable support of all godly persons in every burgh, "as God sall move thair hertis" (*Ibid.*, p. 101).

³ Glasgow Records, I., p. 223.

⁶ "Sandeill pokis" were small bag-nets used for taking sand-eels.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I., pp. 221-2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I., p. 224.

⁷ Convention Records, II., p. 151.

to them—and specially within their own bounds—was kept clean and unpolluted with dead carrion, carcasses, and other filthy matter hurtful to fishing, to punish the offenders, and to cleanse the river of all filth cast into it, under a penalty of £40 *toties quoties*, payable to the burghs.¹

At the same time Renfrew appeared as a complainant to the convention against Glasgow for having uplifted from its inhabitants six pennies of every thousand herring brought to Glasgow bridge.² This complaint was continued till the convention of 6th July, 1603, at which Glasgow was ordained to cease from uplifting the duty.³ The same convention ordered £18 to be paid to Dumbarton “for reparation of thair herberie.”⁴ A particular convention on 8th July granted licence to that burgh to set in feu or long tacks its “wyld and comoun mwre,” eight miles distant, and in no wise profitable to the inhabitants. This grant was made in respect of the great necessity of their common good for reparation of the burgh, “quihilk of lait is lyk to be cutit away be the watter of Levin,” and for other objects.⁵

¹ Convention Records, p. 152.

⁴ Convention Records, II., p. 160.

² *Ibid.*, II., p. 151.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 167, 168.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

III.

JAMES VI. OF SCOTLAND AND I. OF ENGLAND, 1603-1625.

On the death of Elizabeth on 24th March, 1603, the succession to the English throne devolved on James VI. of Scotland, who was great-grandson of Margaret of England, the consort of James IV. The peaceful relations between the two countries which followed led to the development of trade, not only between Scotland and England and Ireland, but with Holland, France, and the Baltic provinces. The policy of encouraging the manufactures of the country and of introducing others was recognised, and, as wider commercial ideas extended into the unfree burghs of the kingdom, a general uprising against the narrow restrictive policy on which the royal burghs rested was commenced.

On 7th April, 1603, King James granted a charter under his great seal, by which, on the narrative of his connection with the family of Lennox, and of the lands, lordships, and baronies, bailiary, regality, and archbishopric of Glasgow being in the hands of the Sovereign by reason of the act of parliament, 1587, c. 8,¹ he disposed in feu to Ludovic duke of Lennox and his heirs male, and of tailzie in the estate of Lennox, the lands and barony of Glasgow, castle, city, burgh, and regality of Glasgow, &c., constituting them lords of the whole regality, with the full right of superiority of the same—the duke and his heirs male paying for the lands and barony, castle, city, burgh, and royalty, £304 8s. 4d. of money, 36 chalders 4 bolls of meal, 31 chalders 5 bolls of barley, 13 chalders 4 bolls of oats, 49 dozen of capons, 31 dozen of poultry, and 14 dozen of kane salmon &c.²

In July, 1604, the laird of Blair and others were commissioned by the Privy Council to visit the harbour of Irvine.³

At the convention on 5th July, 1604, a complaint which Dumbarton had preferred against both Glasgow and Renfrew—the former for having levied a penny of custom at its bridge, conform to a license long since expired, and the latter for suffering a number of unfreemen to keep open markets in selling staple

¹ Intituled “Annexionation of the temporalities of benefices to the Crown.” Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 192, No. 74.

² *Ibid.*, p. 258, No. 88.

³ Privy Council Register, VII., 9.

wares in the clachans of Kilmacolm and the new kirk of Greenock, within their liberty and freedom, without control.¹ To that complaint it was replied for Glasgow, at the convention on 2nd July, 1605, that the license referred to had not expired, and for Renfrew that it had done diligence against unfree traffickers. Glasgow was thereupon ordered to produce its license, and Renfrew to proceed against defaulters.²

On 6th February, 1605, Glasgow, yielding to the pressure which had been ineffectively put upon it by the Convention of Burghs in 1595, 1596, 1597, and 1598,³ adopted a Letter of Guildry, which prescribed the privileges and prerogatives of the merchant and craft ranks of the burgh.⁴ This important document is, with certain modifications subsequently adopted, still operative. It consists of three divisions, each with subdivisions. The first treats of the "Dean of Guild" and the merchant rank; the second of the "Deacon-Convener" and the crafts; and the third of the "Visitor" of maltmen and mealmen and those of this craft. Each of these three divisions had a distinctive head. That of the merchants was the dean of guild; that of the craftsmen was the deacon-convener; and that of the maltmen and mealmen was the visitor. These officers were elected in this wise. Twenty merchants selected by the dean nominated two of their number, and these, with the old dean of guild, were submitted to the provost, bailies, council, anddeacons, who elected the dean for the ensuing year. The deacons of crafts and their assistants chose two of their number, and their names, with that of the old deacon-convener, were also submitted to the provost, bailies, council, and deacons, who selected the deacon-convener for the ensuing year. The maltmen and meal-

¹ Convention Records, II., p. 178. ² *Ibid.*, p. 202.

³ Convention Records, I., 469, 479, 495; II., 27.

⁴ It is noticeable that the pressure thus put upon Glasgow to adopt a letter of guildry seems to have originated in the convention of burghs in 1595, and was relaxed in 1598 in deference to the wish of the merchants and craftsmen of the city. The lull, if it can be so called, was of short duration, for while M'Ure refers to the existence in Glasgow, as in other towns of Scotland, of a strong feeling of jealousy between the merchant rank and the craftsmen, he says that, about the year 1600, the latter were far more numerous than the former, and, in consequence, claimed an equal share, not only in the government of the city, but in the seafaring trade. This claim was resisted by the merchants, on the ground that merchandise was their proper business, and that every man should hold to his own trade. These differences occasioned "terrible heat, strife, and animosities which threatened to end in bloodshed, for the craftsmen rose up in arms against the merchants." Under these circumstances the magistrates and ministers of the city intervened, with the result that, on 8th November, 1604, each of the parties appointed commissioners to endeavour to bring about an amicable arrangement, and a submission was entered into on 10th November which resulted in a decree arbitral, or letter of guildry, being signed on 6th February, 1605. This document was recorded in the books of the town council and confirmed by it on 16th February, 1605, and ratified by parliament on 11th September, 1672 (1672, c. 129: Acts of Parliament, VIII., 186); Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 181-2, No. 143.

See M'Ure's History of Glasgow, pp. 161-2; Gibson's History, pp. 334-5; View of the Merchants House, pp. 55-6 *et seq.*; Glasgow Charters, I., i., pp. cxx. *et seq.* dlxxii.

men again made up a list from their number, which was also submitted to the provost, bailies, council, and deacons, and from it they selected the visitor for the following year.¹

At an early period after his accession to the throne of England, King James manifested a desire to promote an incorporating union of Scotland with England. Popular opinion in both kingdoms, however, was opposed to it. The hostilities of centuries had left rankling feeling which it seemed hopeless to overcome. Yet the royal influence succeeded, in 1604, in inducing both the English and Scottish parliaments to appoint commissioners to prepare terms of union, Scotland stipulating as a condition of its consent that they should not derogate in any way from its fundamental laws and ancient privileges, offices, rights, dignities, and liberties, and of the religion professed in it.² As the result of the discussion of the subject by the commissioners of the two countries, Sir Francis Bacon and Lord Advocate Hamilton were appointed to formulate the conclusions at which the commissioners had arrived, and which recommended the abrogation of mutually hostile laws, free trade between both countries, and the equitable adjustment of commercial relations with foreign countries. But these recommendations had to be submitted to and approved of by the respective parliaments. That of England, representing the strong feeling of the country, was opposed to all the leading recommendations save the abrogation of "hostile laws." So in July, 1605, concluded the English parliament. In August the Scottish parliament was prepared, in deference largely to the wishes of the King, to meet England half-way. Such being the attitude of the two parties, however, all that could be effected was the abrogation of hostile laws, common citizenship for Scottish and English subjects born after the Union of the Crowns, and the appointment of a Commissioner to represent the King in Scotland.³

At the convention on 2nd July, 1605, Renfrew reported that, as directed by the previous convention, it had proceeded against the "clachans" of Kilmalcolm and "the new kirk of Grinok," within its liberty, for suffering a number of unfreemen to keep open market in selling of staple wares, and it produced letters of horning executed against some of the unfree traffickers. The convention ordered the letters to be registered against such as had suspended them or found caution, and to prosecute action before the lords of session against all offenders within the liberty of the burgh, reporting its diligence to the next convention.⁴

¹ Case for the magistrates and council in a question with the dean of guild of Glasgow and his council.

² On 21st August, 1604, the Convention of Burghs, "after lang ressoneing," adopted certain articles to be given to the commissioners of burghs appointed to pass to England for treating of the matter of the Union (Convention Records, II., p. 189).

³ Acts of Parliament, IV., pp. 259-371. Burton's History of Scotland (2nd edition), V., pp. 401-415. Hume Brown's History of Scotland, II., pp. 246, 248.

⁴ Convention Records, II., p. 202.

On the following day Dumbarton craved support for “the reparatioun of thair burgh quhilk is altogidder rwyneit be the violent invasioun of the water of Levin, and for dереcting of ane man to his Majestie to suite his Majestis supply to that wark.” The commissioners resolved to consider the application at next convention, and directed each burgh to come instructed with an answer.¹

On 27th August, 1605, Glasgow appointed seven commissioners to confer with Dumbarton as to the custom of the bridge and water;² and in December of the same year Fallisdaill was sent to consult the young laird of Merchiston concerning the water of Leven, and, if thought good by him, to bring Henry Crawford from Fife to meet Glencairn, Abercorn, and Blantyre at Dumbarton.³

On 15th October the town council of Glasgow also issued the following among other instructions to its water sergeant:—

To report to the bailies all wrongs and bloods committed at the water; and to take caution of the committers to answer at law before the bailies.

To suffer no stones or ballast to be cast out of boats and barks into the water, or at the waterside; and to accuse any person who does so before the bailies.⁴

Recognising the estate of the city as being at that time, “in quantitie and number of traffiequers” and other inhabitants, inferior to few of the cities and burghs of the kingdom,⁵ the King caused the duke of Lennox to demit all claim of superiority in the election of its magistrates, and declared by his letter, dated 27th September, 1605, and subscribed also by the duke in token of his consent, that Glasgow should have “als frie electioun of their magistrats yeirlic as either Edinburgh, Perth, Dundee, Stirling, or ony other frie burgh or citie within this our realme or kingdome, and als frie as ony burgh of regalitie quahatsomever.”⁶ The privilege thus proposed to be accorded, had it been carried into effect, would have placed Glasgow in the position of the most favoured royal burgh in regard to the election of its magistrates. It was obviously the outcome of previous negotiations, for, on the 3rd of the previous month of August, a deputation had been appointed to accompany the provost to Edinburgh to “oured and end our liberty.” Again, on the 27th of the same month, the provost was earnestly requested to ride to London to get “our liberty” passed by the King’s signature and under the great seal. It may therefore have been under the pressure thus brought to bear upon him that the King granted the letter above referred to. Opposition to the grant, however, appears to have been offered, for a minute of the town council sets forth that a bailie and councillor represented the King’s good will and affection in perfecting the liberties of the

¹ Convention Records, II., pp. 207-8.

² Irving’s Dumbartonshire, p. 167.

² Glasgow Records, I., p. 232.

⁴ Glasgow Records, I., p. 237.

⁵ In his “View of the City,” published in 1736, M’Ure gives a list of the linen and woollen drapers, commonly called English merchants since 1600 (1830 edition), p. 168.

⁶ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 269, No. 89. Privy Council Register, VII., p. 141.

burgh according to his first letter; that the earl of Dunbar and Lord Home of Berwick, treasurer, had been appointed to see what was necessary done, but that, by untrue reports of the enemies of the common weal, the King and the duke of Lennox, and also apparently the Lord Treasurer, were informed that it was not the desire of the community and honest rank of the burgh that these liberties should be granted. The council, therefore, resolved, on 28th December, 1605, to ride to Edinburgh to obtain the grant.¹ What followed on that resolution does not appear, but, on 10th January, 1606, the provost, accompanied by one of the bailies and the deacon convener, were despatched to London with letters to the King and the duke of Lennox on the subject.² This mission appears to have elicited from the King a satisfactory answer, which was read, on 6th March,³ to the council. This letter appears to have been followed on 7th July by the drafting of an act of parliament, superscribed by the King, in which—reciting the developments and services of the city—he declared that in future it should have the free election of its magistrates, and that the approval of its archbishops, or any other subject, should not be necessary.⁴ This draft was remitted to the next session of parliament, but it appears, from a minute of the town council on 19th July, that the ratification of the King's letter and the passing of the proposed act by parliament were prevented by the opposition of certain malcontents in and outside of the council. How far this result may have been influenced by the "trouble and sedition in the town," to which the council records refer as existing at this time,⁵ it

¹ Glasgow Records, I., pp. 230-1, 243, 244.

² Glasgow Records, I., p. 245.

² *Ibid.*, p. 244.

⁴ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 271, No. 90.

⁵ The story of this sedition, and the proceedings which followed upon it are detailed in the Privy Council Register, vol. VII.

In July, 1606, a great commotion was raised in the city by Sir Mathew Stewart of Minto, his son, and a number of burgesses who associated themselves with them against the magistrates, and, notwithstanding the presence and commandment of several members of the Privy Council, who were in the city at the time, held unlawful assemblies and took up arms in resistance to the authorities, whose lives even were imperilled. The magistrates thereupon presented a complaint to the Privy Council against the Mintos and their associates, setting forth that the liberties which the town had succeeded in obtaining from the King, with the consent of the Duke of Lennox, would prevent the house of Minto from afterwards exercising "that sway, government and authority" over the town which they had exercised under the duke, and that the knowledge of this led the Mintos, father and son, to stir up the tumult. The Privy Council thereupon appointed the Earl of Wigtown and two others to take measures for pacifying the trouble and commotion. These commissioners forthwith placed representatives of both parties, Sir George Elphinstone, provost, and one of the bailies, and the Stewarts and some of their supporters, in ward—the former in the castle of Glasgow, and the latter in the castle of Dumbarton. But on 9th August both the parties were transferred to Stirling—Elphinstone and the bailie under caution for 500 marks, and the Stewarts under caution of £1,000. Others who had taken part in the riot were imprisoned, some in Perth and some in Dundee. Trial of the rioters took place in Stirling, on the 26th of August, before the Privy Council (Privy Council Register, VII., p. 233), and the complaint of the magistrates was investigated with the result that the Stewarts and their supporters were found guilty, except as regarded

is impossible to say. Perhaps the resolution to restore Episcopacy may have had some effect in leading to a change of the King's plans. At all events, on 11th July, 1606, an act was passed "anent the restitution of the estate of bishops," without prejudice to letters of gift and pension granted, *inter alios*, to the duke of Lennox furth of the fruits of the archbishopric, to be enjoyed by him during his lifetime only.¹ It is to be noticed also that on 30th September, 1606, a letter from the King to the council intimated his wish to have the election of the magistrates delayed,² and on 1st October he again wrote referring to the "laitt byganc disorder and ryotte" as having given him "most just caus of offence."³ He then proceeded to say that, understanding one of the greatest causes of the disorder to have been the strife and competition betwixt some persons for the place of the provostry, he thought meet, for keeping the city in good order, and for taking away such-like occasion of misdemeanour thereafter, to require them to elect the three persons whom he named to be bailies for the following year. To this sequel to the letter of 27th September, 1605, he added the not insignificant intimation "unto quhais electioun also the archbischope of Glasgo hes given his consent," and he stated "we intend to appoynte no provest presentlye quhill upoun farder advyse we signify our pleasure thairanent." This announcement so conflicted with the letter of 1605 as to require time for consideration, but, on 14th November, 1606, at a meeting of the council, convened in presence of the newly appointed archbishop, "my lord of Glasgow," it was "proponit and offrit" to his lordship, "for estableising of ane solid ordour in cheising of the magistratis heireftir, and for quietnes of this towne, that the lyttis of the balleis be presentit to the bischope as of awld, to the effect his lordschip may mak chois of thrie of the saidis lyttis to be balleis and that the said archbischope propone and present to the balleis and counsale of the town twa or thrie of the said counsale, that ane of thame may be acceptit to be thair provist, or that the said balleis and counsale sall propone and present to the said archbischope twa or thrie of thair counsal, that his lordschip may name one of thame

the charge of forethought felony (*Ibid.*, pp. 240, 247). On the following day the Privy Council, referring to the imprisonment of the offenders, ordered proclamation to be made, and charge given to all and sundry to reverence and obey the magistrates at their highest peril (*Ibid.*, p. 249). On the 31st, again, all the inhabitants were ordered to lay aside their armour, and conduct themselves as peaceable citizens, forbearing to assemble in future without the license of the magistrates, under pain of rigorous punishment (*Ibid.*, pp. 230-1).

On 1st October the king expressed his dissatisfaction with the failure of the privy council to report their proceedings to him, and ordered that both Mintos be retained in ward till his pleasure was intimated, and further that they be both fined in great sums. (Privy Council Register, VII., 501. See also Glasgow Records, II., 249, 250, 251. Glasgow Charters, part I., pp. ccxxx.-v.)

¹ 1606, c. 2. Acts of Parliament, IV., p. 281. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 272, No. 91.

² Glasgow Records, I., pp. 254, 255.

³ Glasgow Records, I., pp. 254, 255.

to be thair provist.”¹ It was agreed that this overture should be reported to the King, and that, until his pleasure was ascertained, the bailies of the previous year should remain in office. In the negotiations which followed, the archbishop appears to have taken a prominent part, and the magistrates and council were subservient, so that the King, resiling from his former engagement, desired the old subordination of the council to the archbishop to be continued.² In the elections of the magistrates at Michaelmas, 1607, and in subsequent years, accordingly, the old forms were observed,³ and the archbishop was acknowledged in all his former privileges.

On 7th July, 1606, the Convention exempted Rothesay, Renfrew, and Rutherglen from attendance at general and particular conventions for five years, provided the expenses which their commissioners would have cost were expended on their bridges, harbours, tolbooths, kirks, or other most necessary common works, and accounted for to the convention. On the same day Glasgow and Dumbarton were found liable, each in £20, for being absent from the convention of that date.⁴

On 8th July, 1606, the convention granted license to Renfrew to impetrare of the king a gift for five years of an impost to be applied in repairing its harbour, and under obligation to account annually to the convention for its application.⁵

As the gift by the King to Dumbarton on 10th September, 1600, was about to expire, the convention, on 11th July, 1606, granted license to it to impetrare a new gift for nineteen years. At the same time, dealing with the supplication on 3rd July, 1605,⁶ that it should grant a supply to enable commissioners from Dumbarton to go to England to crave the King’s support to the burgh, the convention resolved that its members should, on returning home, report the matter to the several burghs, and advise them to authorise their respective commissioners, at the next convention, to contribute towards the expense of the Dumbarton commissioners to London. Meanwhile the burgh had sent Thomas Fallisdail to London to report its condition to the King, and, on 4th September, the earl of Dunfermline, lord chancellor, at the request of the estates, recommended his Majesty to grant the aid.⁷

¹ Glasgow Records, I., p. 257.

⁴ Convention Records, II., pp. 211-2.

² *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 213-4.

³ *Ibid.*, I., p. 269.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 208, 220.

⁷ On 10th July, 1606, the privy council addressed a letter to the King, in which, referring to a report by the royal commissioners as to the £30,000 which would be required to protect the town from the violence of the water, recommended that his Majesty should, out of a great taxation granted to him, make a gift to the burgh for its help (Privy Council Register, VII., p. 497. Letters and State papers (Abbotsford Club), p. 88). The convention also gave assistance to Dumbarton and other two burghs by diminishing their contributions under the tax roll for three years, on account of their decay occasioned by the plague during several years (Convention Records, II., p. 220).

On 11th July, 1606, the burgh of Irvine obtained an act of parliament which, in consequence of the great increase of unfree traffickers within its bounds, who bare no burdens, but sailed out of the country with ships and barks as if they were free burgesses, to the prejudice of the King's customs, prohibited all persons dwelling in the burgh, but not being burgesses and freemen, from using any privilege or liberty belonging to burgesses and freemen, by keeping open booths with merchandise, or by sailing and trafficking out or in the country with barks or ships.¹

On 27th November, 1606, an action brought by a number of Glasgow merchants against the tacksmen of customs for exacting excessive dues on salt, victual, &c., imported by them, was decided by the privy council in favour of the merchants.²

On 27th January, 1607, Dumbarton petitioned the privy council setting forth the dangerous condition of the burgh, occasioned by the violence of the Leven and the rage of the sea, and the expressed intention of the King to help the town out of his own coffers after he had seen what would be produced by an impost on all vessels entering or leaving the Clyde. The privy council were, therefore, craved to pass an act authorising an impost to be levied on all goods coming in and passing furth of the Clyde for the space of nineteen years, and also to grant letters of charge requiring Glasgow and Renfrew to appear in the matter.³ A charge to Glasgow having been given, it appointed two bailies, two merchants, and two craftsmen to appear before the Lords on 17th February.⁴ The result does not appear, but on 3rd July, 1607, this application was before the convention of burghs, which met this year in Dumbarton, and when it was being considered the earl of Glencairn appeared with a royal commission to him to aid the burgh, and a missive letter from the King, dated 2nd June, recommending the matter to the favourable consideration of the convention. The commissioner of Dumbarton also produced writs and letters from his Majesty to the parliament and privy council in regard to the subject. The convention thereupon recognised the necessity of that burgh receiving greater help than they had contemplated, and resolved to report the matter to their constituents with a view to the next convention, or a prior particular convention, taking such action as might be necessary.⁵ Meanwhile, on 11th August, 1607, an act of parliament was passed which recited the result of an

¹ 1606, c. 36. *Acts of Parliament*, IV., p. 305.

In Timothy Pont's "Cuninghame Topographized," in the early part of the seventeenth century, he describes Irvine as the "heid burrough and chieffe porte of the county of Cuninghame, but much decayed from what it was anciently, being stopped with shelves of sand, which hinder the near approach of shipping." (Glasgow Edition, 1876. p. 215).

² *Privy Council Register*, VII., 277.

⁴ *Glasgow Records*, I., p. 260.

³ *Privy Council Register*, XIV., p. 467.

⁵ *Convention Records*, II., p. 240.

examination by royal commissioners as to the requirements of the case, and their opinion that at least £30,000 Scots would be needed to protect the burgh from destruction. Parliament, therefore, appointed a taxation of 25,000 merks to be levied for the purpose—12,500 merks to be paid by the spiritual estate, 8,333 merks 3s. 4d. by the barons and freeholders, and 4,166 merks 8s. 10d. by the burghs—all to be paid previous to 1st February, 1608, and to be levied by collectors approved by the convention, and expended at their sight. A particular convention was held on the same day, and arrangements were made for carrying the act into effect.¹ Moreover, the privy council not only, on 13th August, 1607, continued the grant of 1600 for nineteen years, but subsequently addressed a strong recommendation to the King to supplement it.² On 15th April, 1608, the King sent a letter to the privy council, in which, referring to the condition of Dumbarton and the inadequacy of the parliamentary grant to meet the cost of the work, he directed an additional grant of 12,000 merks Scots to be paid out of the readiest of the revenues to meet the cost of the necessary works.³

In February of the same year Dumbarton appears to have raised an action against Glasgow, before the privy council, concluding for payment of an impost on all goods entering or passing furth of the Clyde for a period of nineteen years, and citing it to appear before the lords on the 17th of that month. Glasgow, accordingly, on 12th February, appointed two bailies and two merchants to appear before the council and defend the action.⁴

On 2nd May the town council of Glasgow, considering that ships and boats from England, Ireland, the Highlands, and other parts frequently came with victual within the liberty and freedom of "their river of Clyde," ordained, with a view to such traffic being for the general benefit, that all victual so brought should be first taken to the key and port of Broomielaw, and sold to the common profit and use of all the freemen and neighbours of the burgh, in such quantities as they might need, or else be sold to any freeman of the burgh, provided he gave

¹ 1607, c. 15. Acts of Parliament, IV., p.

² Privy Council Register, VII., pp. 431,

376. Convention Records, II., p. 247.

497, 538-9.

³ Glen's History of Dumbarton, p. 149.

It appears, however, that no part of the 12,000 merks thus authorised was paid previous to 19th August, 1611, for, on that date, the King wrote to the privy council, directing it "to cause full payment [to] be made with all convenient expeditioun." [Privy Council Register, IX., 629.] Still, and notwithstanding farther directions by the King to the same effect, no payment of the 12,000 merks, or any part thereof, appears to have been made on 11th October, 1612, for on that date the King wrote a peremptory letter expressing his dissatisfaction, and ordering "dew payment to be made, to the intent wee be no further troubled." It appears from this letter that the execution of the work and the disbursement of the necessary moneys had been entrusted by the King to persons whose accounts had been allowed by the commissioners of burghs, and whose "private estate" had, in consequence of the non-payment, been "utterly overthrown." [Privy Council Register, IX., 744.]

⁴ Glasgow Records, I., p. 260.

a part, more or less, to such freemen as required it, that the victuals were there measured, that the burgesses were answerable for the custom of the ladle, and that the victual remained for twenty-four hours at the Broomielaw after being sold.¹

On 2nd June thereafter an action appears to have been brought on behalf of Glasgow and Dumbarton and three merchants of Glasgow against Anderson, Faulis, and Dunlop, three burgesses of Glasgow, for having purchased deals from the master and owner of a ship called the Salmon of Reipe in Amsterdam, before offering the cargo to the two towns. The defenders were accordingly fined "£100 for making block and bargain, and £40 each for forestalling the pier and market-place." They were also ordained to make their purchases forthcoming for the common use of both towns for such prices as the defenders had agreed to give the Dutchmen.² This decree was, however, suspended by the defenders, but on 22nd July authority was given by Glasgow to the commissioners named to meet with Dumbarton, and vote and conclude the matter.³

At the convention in Dumbarton on 1st July, 1607, Renfrew, in verification of its having done diligence against unfree traders, regratters and forestallers, and outland burgesses, produced (1) Letters of Suspension raised by six persons in Kilmalcolm and four persons in Greenock, and (2) Letters of Horning against others. The commissioners thereupon ordained Renfrew to prosecute the same, and report its diligence to the next convention. The convention also ordained the burgh to require a merchant who had been made a burgess to reside within it within a limited time, or otherwise to discharge him of his liberty.⁴

On the same day the convention, finding the royal burghs heavily prejudiced by the burghs of barony, whose inhabitants pass through the realm taking upon them, not only the trade of country wares, but of foreign merchandise, pretending some coloured rights thereto by long oversight and by their recently purchased erections, appointed the commissioners of four burghs to pass to the Lord Clerk Register and other persons, and "travel with his lordship and them," to collect and set down in writing the heads of difference between the liberties of free royal burghs and burghs of barony, conform to the laws of the realm, acts of parliament and of the sovereign, custom and practice, rights and infestments of burghs, and decrees of the lords of session, if any. These being got, Edinburgh was ordained to advise with lawyers on the subject, and afterwards to consult with thirteen

¹ Glasgow Records, I., pp. 262-3.

² *Ibid.*, I., pp. 265-6.

³ *Ibid.*, I., p. 268. On 4th July, 1607, the convention, finding that all burghs should make their form of election of magistrates and council conform to the acts of parliament and burghs, ordained Dumbarton to produce to the next convention the form of electing its magistrates and councils to the effect that if it was not in accordance with these acts the convention might take action to ensure conformity (Convention Records, II, p. 243). On 6th July, 1608, an act of the town council of Dumbarton was produced to the convention setting forth that the above act had been complied with (*Ibid.*, p. 255).

⁴ Convention Records, II., p. 233.

other burghs as to having what was necessary either ratified by parliament or declared by a judgment of the court of session.¹

On 11th August, 1607, parliament passed another act against unfreemen. Referring to the injury daily sustained by the burgess inhabitants of royal burghs through the continual increase in unfree traffickers in various parts of the country, who, though not burgesses, kept open booths, bought and sold merchandise, and otherwise used the liberties and privileges of free burghs, in defraud of the King's customs, it ordered such practice to cease, under the pains declared by the several statutes in relation thereto.² It also prescribed proceedings to follow on decrets of the convention of burghs.

Evidently the relations between Glasgow and Dumbarton at this time were not satisfactory. In September, 1607, Robert Mure, the son of a burgess of Glasgow, and Alexander Dunlop, a merchant there, complained to the privy council that when returning from Dumbarton one of the bailies of that burgh assembled a number of the inhabitants, armed with jacks, corslets, steel bonnets, picks, lances, halberts, swords, and other weapons, and, following the complainers, overtook them at Kilpatrick, and there "maist fearslie" set upon and would have slain them had the country people not prevented. The accused were charged to appear and answer this complaint, but, failing to do so, were denounced rebels.³

On the 11th of the following month of August, a particular convention made arrangements for the collection of the taxation imposed for the protection of Dumbarton,⁴ and "incains it sall please the Kingis Majeste, of his liberalite, to bestow forder soumeis for the furtherance of the said wark," the same was to be applied by the advice of the burghs.⁵

It has been mentioned that the filthy condition of the Clyde in 1602 led the convention, on the complaint of Ayr, to require the burghs of Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Renfrew to see that the river within their respective bounds was kept free from matter hurtful to the fishing. This order Glasgow appears to have endeavoured to carry into effect, for in 1605, as has been seen, its water sergeant was ordered not to suffer stones or ballast to be cast out of boats and barks in the river, or on its sides, and to prosecute such persons as did so.⁶ But the order of the convention does not seem to have had the desired effect, for on 4th July, 1607, it was repeated, and each of the three burghs was required to report its diligence to the next convention.⁷ Obviously, however, the accomplishment of the work thus ordered was beyond the humble means of the city at that time, for on 30th June, 1608, it directed its commissioner to the convention to appeal to that body "for help of their bridge and river."⁸ All that appears to have been done by the

¹ Convention Records, II., p. 235.

² 1607, c. 13. Acts of Parliament, IV., p. 375.

³ Privy Council Register, VII., pp. 437-8.

⁴ Convention Records, II., p. 247.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 247-8.

⁶ Glasgow Records, I., p. 237.

⁷ Convention Records, II., p. 242.

⁸ Glasgow Records, I., p. 284.

convention on 5th July of that year was to ordain Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Renfrew to cause "pen an article" to be given into the next parliament for cleansing the Clyde, and punishing such persons as defiled it by "deid careouns, buckeis and sic uther filth, hurtful to the fishing."¹

On the 7th of the same month the convention, as authorised by the act of parliament of 11th August, 1607, granting a taxation of 25,000 merks to Dumbarton, empowered Edinburgh, Glasgow, Stirling, Ayr, and Irvine to see to the proper execution of the work for which the tax was authorised. By this time the necessary works had been begun, and material had been provided by the two burgesses of Dumbarton who had been appointed collectors of the tax, but they were ordered to act under the direction and control of the five burghs then appointed.² The collectors' accounts connected with this work appear not to have been kept in a satisfactory manner, and strict directions were given by the conventions of 6th July, 1609,³ and 5th July, 1610,⁴ as to these, the execution of the works, the purchase of material, and the employment of workmen.

On 30th June, 1608, the privy council, understanding the trade of navigation to be greatly hindered through default of good and profitable laws which might lead to its advancement, commissioned Edinburgh, Dundee, Aberdeen, St. Andrews, Glasgow, and eleven other burghs, or a majority of them, to meet and prescribe acts and ordinances for advancing navigation, and to report the same.⁵

On 7th July, 1608, Irvine applied to the convention of burghs for license to "impetrat an impost at their new erectit herbere called the Trone," but the commissioners continued their answer till the next convention, when, on 5th July, 1609, the convention authorised Irvine to apply to the King for the gift of "anchorage and dock silver," to be applied to the building and upholding of its harbour at Troon.⁶

On the same date Rutherglen complained to the convention of burghs that Glasgow levied illegally from the inhabitants of that burgh a custom at the bridge of Glasgow, and a ladleful of bear or malt on their market day.⁷ Glasgow, however, produced, on 3rd July, 1611, a decree of the court of session sustaining its right to levy the ladle custom. That portion of the complaint was

¹ Convention Records, II., p. 251.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 293.

² *Ibid.*, p. 264.

⁵ Privy Council Register, VIII., p. 119.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

⁶ Convention Records, II., pp. 259, 278. See Privy Council Register, X., p. 137.

⁷ Convention Records, II., p. 259. In 1612 the custom of the ladle in Kirkeudbright formed part of the common good (*Ibid.*, p. 347). In 1633 it was also levied by Dundee, but the commissioners of the sheriffdoms of Perth, Angus, and Fife complained of it to parliament as an illegal exaction. The complaint was remitted to the privy council to determine what was or should be the just measure and quantity of the ladle (1633, c. 34. Acts of Parliament, IV., 48), but its decision does not appear. See farther as to ladle duty in Glasgow, *antea*, pp. 28-9, 38.

accordingly dismissed.¹ As regarded the bridge custom, Rutherglen was ordained to pay annually to Glasgow £3 in respect of it.²

On 19th July, 1608, the town council of Dumbarton resolved "to cast anew the old Bishops water gang for carrying off the water of Leven, and enjoyned all persons in the town to assist in the work, under a penalty of 5 lib;"³ but the Duke of Lennox, as proprietor, and Sir William Stewart, as liferenter, of the Mains of Cardross, opposed the carrying out of the council's resolution, on the ground that the cast went through their property.⁴

At this time the main part of the custom levied at the bridge of Glasgow was derived from herrings. An act of the town council on 17th September, 1608, referring to this fact and to the loss which the tacksman of the bridge custom had sustained by the "vehement frost" which had closed the river for sixteen weeks, and had prevented "all leadining" or coming of herring to the bridge during that period, authorised him to be allowed £40.⁵

On 5th July, 1609, the convention authorised Irvine to impetrare of the King a gift of the anchorages and dock silver therein specified to be employed in building and upholding of its harbour, rendering a yearly account to the convention as often as required.⁶

On 6th July, 1609, the convention had under consideration the accounts of the collectors of the taxation of 25,000 merks granted to Dunbarton for protection of the burgh from inundation by the Water of Leven, but found them very imperfect, and ordered the collectors to produce them in more perfect form to the Town Council of Edinburgh previous to 1st November thereafter, to be examined and corrected by it, and reported to the convention. The collectors were ordered to attend that convention.⁷

On 7th January, 1609, King James addressed a letter to the Privy Council concerning the harbour of Ayr. That burgh having appealed to him for assistance

¹ Convention Records, II., p. 315. In ancient times the superintendence of the weights and measures of Scotland was committed to different burghs. Edinburgh had charge of the measure of length, Lanark of weights, Stirling of liquid measures, and Linlithgow of dry measures. But in 1617, parliament, recognising the necessity for a general adjustment of weights and measures, the diversity and uncertainty of which was greatly complained of, appointed a commission to devise a plan to remedy the subject of complaint (1617, c. 8 (22). Acts of Parliament, IV., 535-541). These commissioners reported to parliament on 19th February, 1618 (*Ibid.*, Appendices, p. 585), and on 4th August, 1621, parliament ratified and confirmed that report (1621, c. 16. Acts of Parliament, V., 614), which prescribed the standard quantity of all the weights and measures of Scotland. See also Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 575-6.

² Convention Records, II., pp. 259, 277, 293, 315.

³ The bishop who first cast the water gang is supposed to have been a member of the Lennox family, afterwards Bishop of Orkney. MacLeod's Ancient Records of Dumbarton, p. 21.

⁴ MacLeod *Ibid.*

⁵ Glasgow Records, II., p. 290.

⁶ Convention Records, II., p. 278.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II., p. 282.

in completing the works, which the burgh was unable to do, he desired the council to inquire as to the matter and report its opinion to him.¹

Nothing appears to have been done as to the Clyde by the convention at its meeting in July, 1609, probably owing to the absence of the commissioner for Glasgow, James Inglis, who was excused by the privy council from being present by reason of his being employed "in the public affairs of the realm."² But on 14th October in the same year the town council took independent action to prevent the condition of the river in and near the town from becoming worse. After narrating that the river, and specially the pier and port at the Broomielaw,³ was much abused by those who brought barks and boats there, and cast out ballast at the Broomielaw, they subjected all persons, free and unfree, who did so, to a penalty of £5 Scots [8s. 4d. sterling], *toties quoties*, and to further punishment at the sight of the magistrates and council. Such ballast was ordered to be deposited forty feet beyond the flood mark.⁴ On 9th November also the bailies, council, deacons, and certain merchants, convened to consult as to the appointment of a commissioner to accompany the archbishop to the King, to represent the ruin and daily decay of the cathedral, river, and bridge, and to beseech his help, appointed Robert Scott, minister of the burgh, to undertake that duty, and to receive such help as his Majesty might give.⁵

On 13th December, 1609, King James VI. granted a charter to Dumbarton, by which, after referring to the grants made to the burgh by his predecessors, and to its condition, occasioned by the action of the rivers Clyde and Leven, he confirmed the charter by King Alexander II., and a number of other charters and writs therein mentioned, including charters by King Alexander III. and King David II. Moreover, he of new granted the burgh, with all its rights and privileges, including fishings "of salmon and other fish, in salt water as well as fresh, within the bounds of the rivers Clyde and Leven," empowering the magistrates to intromit with, uplift, and receive all the petty customs and other duties between the water of Kelvin and head of Loch Long. The charter then conveyed to the magistrates and community all the common lands of the burgh,⁶ and, *inter alia*, the freedom of the water of Clyde, with the fishing of salmon and other fishes from the water of Kelvin to the head of Loch Long, to be

¹ Privy Council Register, VIII., p. 546.

² Convention Records, II., p. 273.

³ Whatever may have been the state of matters in 1597, *antea*, p. 44, this shows that there was a "pier and port" at the Broomielaw previous to 1609. This may have been the "new haven" which was undergoing repairs in 1631 (*postea*, p. 79).

⁴ Glasgow Records, I., p. 306.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 308. The letter to the King entrusted to the commissioner for delivery is printed in the Glasgow Charters, vol. II., pp. 573-4.

⁶ These appear to have included the lands now referred to as "the drowned lands," which were sought to be protected by the eounceil's act of 19th July, 1608. They are deseribed by Mr. MacLeod in his Council Records of Dumbarton, pp. 22, 23, 28, 30.

possessed by them and their successors as freely as they and their predecessors possessed the same any time past. It also authorised the magistrates to uplift and receive the small customs within the bounds of the Leven and Clyde, with the duties of cocquets, entries of ships and vessels, anchorages, water measures, dock mails, &c., with duties of measurage and weyage, and with all other customs, impositions, and duties of goods to be transported to and from the burgh, ports, shores, and havens whatsoever, within the said rivers and bounds, with all other customs and impositions of the same, as freely as they and their predecessors then were, or had been, in possession of uplifting and receiving, or had possessed or used in any time past. The King further forbade the lieges and foreign merchants coming with their vessels, loaded with goods or merchandise, within the Clyde and Leven, and specially within the bounds foresaid, to break bulk, tap, or sell until they came with the same to the burgh of Dumbarton, and entered their ships, &c., with all their goods and merchandise, in the books of the burgh, and there made market with free burgesses, and livered (discharged) their vessels according to ancient custom, and received cocquet before their departure, and paid the specified dues. The charter also conferred powers on the magistrates and community to turn the Leven from its then course to the old course.¹

The terms of this charter to Dumbarton, as interpreted and sought to be applied by that burgh, were such as, if carried into effect, would have given it a practical monopoly of the river traffic, and were regarded by Glasgow to be so prejudicial to its ancient rights and liberties as to necessitate strenuous opposition to it. The provost and common procurator were therefore appointed, on 5th March, 1610, to proceed to Edinburgh, and, after consulting with lawyers, to institute suspension or reduction of the grant, founding on the charters by King Alexander; the confirmation by King Robert; the decree of parliament against Dumbarton, under the great seal, as to the liberty of the river; the confirmation of the market rights of the city by King Robert; King Alexander's gift; the indenture between Glasgow and Dumbarton as to the liberty of the river; a decree at the instance of both towns against Lady Lyle for buying salt on the river; an act of the privy council against Dumbarton, made at Stirling; an act of the burghs explaining their former act as to the liberty of Dumbarton being limited to the water of Leven; a compromise between Glasgow and Dumbarton, under form of an instrument; a summons at the instance of Glasgow and Dumbarton against a Frenchman "for ane venture schip;" and letters granted

¹ This charter forms one of the seven bequeathed by Dr. David Laing to the University of Edinburgh. Dr. Laing died in October, 1873. Calendar of Laing Charters, No. 1565, p. 380. Great Seal Register, VII., No. 190. Irving's History of Dumbartonshire, pp. 173-183.

The charter was ratified by parliament by the following acts:—(1) 23rd October, 1612—1612, c. 17, Acts of Parliament, IV., p. 482; (2) 17th November, 1641—1641, c. 199, *Ibid.*, V., p. 453; (3) 20th May, 1661—1661, c. 234, *Ibid.*, VII., p. 219. See also Privy Council Register, XI., pp. 200, 219-20, under protest by Renfrew.

to Glasgow and Dumbarton by Queen Mary against strangers passing to the Isles.¹ Negotiations appear to have been then opened between the two burghs for a settlement of the dispute, and on 7th April, 1610, a deputation was appointed by Glasgow to meet Dumbarton "at the bornis, on the 11th of April," and "assay how the contraversie by law concerning the liberty of the river might be settled."² Another meeting for the same object was appointed for 21st June,³ but these negotiations proved abortive, and on 6th June, 1611, the council of Glasgow appealed to the merchants and craftsmen of the city for a contribution to meet the cost of the impending litigation, and also of a charter which was being obtained from the crown. This application was met by a voluntary contribution of £200 from each body, with a promise of more if required.⁴ On the 14th of the same month a bailie was directed to proceed to Edinburgh, taking with him many of the town's charters instructing the rights of Glasgow in the question with Dumbarton.⁵

On 5th July, 1610, Glasgow again applied to the convention for support in taking away the sands in the Clyde, which stopped ships and barks from coming to the town.⁶

Glasgow, like the other western burghs, had a grievance against the men of the Isles, for the oppressions often done by them, their kin, friends, servants, and dependents, in taking the goods of these burghs furth of their barks, ships, and boats, and otherwise oppressing them by exacting large sums of money from them, under colour of ground mail. Understanding that "the special men of the Isles" were to be in Edinburgh on 26th June, it was resolved to send a commissioner to the privy council on that day, to give in a complaint against them, and to crave order to be taken with them to indemnify the neighbours of the city. A commissioner was accordingly appointed.⁷

As if to restrict the effect of the Dumbarton charter of 1609, King James granted a charter to Glasgow on 8th April, 1611, confirming all the rights and privileges previously granted to it, disposing the burgh in feu farm, and erecting it into a royal burgh, with all the liberties and privileges belonging thereto, to be held of the crown for service of burgh used and wont, subject to a payment of sixteen merks to the archbishop, and under reservation of his right to elect the magistrates as then in use. By this charter the King, *inter alia*, conferred upon the burgh the right of loading and unloading ships, barks, and other vessels, of buying all sorts of goods and merchandise, home or foreign,

¹ Glasgow Records, I., pp. 309, 310. ³ *Ibid.*, I., p. 315. ⁵ *Ibid.*, I., p. 321.

² *Ibid.*, I., p. 311.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I., pp. 320-1.

⁶ Convention Records, II., 306. It may be noticed that at this time (1610) a Dutch ship, 110 feet in length, was permitted to discharge its cargo of timber at Pot of the Rig, its great length making it impossible to get into Dumbarton (Irving's History of Dumbartonshire, p. 173).

⁷ When an enumeration of the population of Glasgow was made in 1610 the whole number was 7644 (Cleland's Rise and Progress, p. 200).

⁷ Glasgow Records, I., 315.

coming to the Clyde, within all its bounds from the Clockstane (about twenty-seven miles below Glasgow) to the bridge, salmon fishings between and above the bridge of Glasgow on either bank, possessed by the citizens and their predecessors, with privilege of the water and river of Clyde, trade and traffic thereof, and others whatsoever pertaining to the burgh, and wherever its inhabitants had been and were in use and possession by land, sea, and water.¹ Understanding that the King had passed the signature for this charter, which had been sent up to London with the archbishop, the provost and one of the bailies were sent to Edinburgh by the town council, on 23rd April, to get it passed the seals.² Following upon this, the town council of Glasgow, on 8th May, asked the provost, who was about to proceed to Culross, to bring back with him, at the expense of the town, one Henry Crawford, "to see the river, and consider how it might be helped."³ What the result was does not appear.

The claims and exactions of Dumbarton in regard to the trade on the Clyde—founded, or largely encouraged, by the extravagant clauses of King James' charter to that burgh—led several merchants and skippers of Glasgow to institute proceedings in the court of session to have Dumbarton restrained in its interferences and exactions. The result of this action, after a full consideration of the rights of parties, was a decision, dated 25th July, 1611, negativing the claims of Dumbarton.⁴

At the convention of 4th July, 1611, the accounts connected with the improvement of the harbour of Dumbarton were produced, but the convention was still dissatisfied, and some unpleasantness resulted.⁵ On 19th August, 1611, King James wrote the privy council referring to his grant to Dumbarton of 12,000 merks for its defence from the violence of the water, and to his having directed various warrants for payment. Notwithstanding, he had learned that no part had been paid. He therefore ordered full payment to be made with all convenient speed.⁶

On 8th June, 1612, Glasgow appointed six persons to prepare chains, cables, and other things for removing the great stones discovered at Dumbuck ford, and, to facilitate the work, divided the town into eight divisions, for casting the water above and below the bridge.⁷ And on 4th July the council, for furthering this work so begun, ordered twenty workmen for the merchants and twenty for the crafts, to be provided by the dean of guild and deacon-convener, to go down to the ford on the 8th instant. Three persons were also appointed to accompany

¹ Great Seal Register, VII., No. 462. Glasgow Charters, I., part ii., Nos. 92, 93. Ratified by the Acts 1612, c. 18, and 1633, c. 79, Acts of Parliament, IV., 484, and V., p. 88. Against this ratification Renfrew protested.

² Glasgow Records, I., p. 319.

³ *Ibid.*, I., p. 320.

⁴ Glasgow Charters, I., part ii., p. 464, No. 154; II., p. 594.

⁵ Convention Records, II., p. 317.

⁶ Privy Council Register, IX., p. 629.

⁷ Glasgow Records, I., p. 329.

and oversee the workmen.¹ Nine of the persons so ordered, however, failed to appear, and were fined £6 each. The remanent merchants were also ordained to contribute to the expenses of the workmen who gave their services.² At the convention on 9th July, 1612, the commissioners of twelve burghs were appointed to deal with various subjects, including the employment of the taxation granted to Dumbarton,³ and on 1st August, 1612, consideration of the work and accounts was remitted to the representatives of these burghs.⁴ Notwithstanding this order, payment appears not to have been made, for on 11th October, 1612, the King again wrote to the privy council expressing his surprise to learn that no part of the account had been paid, and ordering instant payment.⁵

At the next convention, on 9th July, 1613, reference was made to the King's letters, "direct at the instance of my lords treasurer and advocate," and, in obedience to these, the hearing and allowing of the accounts were continued till they were produced before the lords.⁶ But still nothing definite appears to have been done, for on 8th July, 1614, the convention ordered its agent to get the accounts remitted back to the burghs conform to the act of parliament.⁷

On 8th July, 1612, a rental of the common good of Irvine was produced to the convention, and ordered to be recorded. In it the revenues are stated to amount to £395 16s. 6d., and the expenditure to £329 11s. 4d.; besides the expenses in keeping conventions, maintenance of the kirk, causeways, tron, harbour, and common works, and other necessaries, for which yearly taxation had to be made. The convention ordered the burgh "to put its common rent to the highest avail before the next convention," and then to report its diligence in the matter.⁸

On 31st July, 1612, the burghs of Ayr, Irvine, Glasgow, Dumbarton, and others presented a supplication to the privy council setting forth that an act of the council prohibited the making, salting, packing, or peilling of herrings for transport furth of the realm before 1st October, yearly, under pain of confiscation; that searchers had been appointed annually to apprehend all herring salted, peiled, and packed before that date; that the result had been that the taking of herring was prevented, to the great hurt of the lieges and the impoverishment of the herring fishers of the head burghs of the west seas. The suppliant burgh therefore craved that the act complained of should be repealed, and the burghs allowed to resort to their former practice. Authority was thereupon given to the merchants and freemen of the free burghs of the west seas to make, salt, pack, and peil herrings before 1st October in that and subsequent years.⁹

¹ Glasgow Records, I., p. 329.

⁶ Convention Records, II., p. 412.

² *Ibid.*, I., p. 330.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II., p. 459.

³ Convention Records, II., p. 354.

⁸ Convention Records, II., pp. 344-6.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II., p. 376.

⁹ Muniments of Ayr, pp. 145 6.

⁵ Privy Council Register, IX., p. 744.

On 9th July, 1613, the convention authorised Irvine to impetrare of the King a gift of an impost for thirteen years of every ship, bark, or crear, at each time of its resort to the burgh, and of every fish boat once a year, at the time of fishing, and to apply the same towards the repair of the harbour. This impost it was provided should be taken only within the harbour and liberties and freedom thereof.¹

The burgh thereafter, on 25th August, presented a petition to the Privy Council setting forth the ruinous condition of its harbour; its inability to make the necessary repairs upon it; the exhaustion of its funds in repairing it, and providing another harbour beside the Troon; the visitations ordered from time to time with a view to the establishment of an impost on vessels arriving at its harbour and that at Troon; the impost called the "anchorage and dock silver," authorised to be applied for by the convention on 9th July, 1609, to be levied on all ships arriving in the harbour of Troon for five years, and to be expended in the maintenance of that harbour; and the authority given by the convention on 9th July, 1613, to apply for an impost leviable for thirteen years in repairing the harbour of Irvine. The burgh therefore craved the Privy Council to authorise these imposts, and authority was given to the provost and bailies of Irvine to levy the same.²

On 7th July, 1612, the convention ordered various burghs, including Glasgow, to cause the calsays "within thair ports and touns" to be sufficiently repaired, and to report their diligence to the next convention, under penalty of £100 each.³

It appears that, about this time, among other precepts granted by the King was one for 5,000 marks, to be applied towards the reparation of the cathedral of Glasgow. On 27th February, 1612, however, it was announced to the privy council that his Majesty had directed that no precepts sent by him should be answered till his debts were paid.⁴ On 21st December, 1613, the King granted another charter to Glasgow, by which, on a recital of the expenses incurred by the city in supporting the metropolitan church and upholding the bridge, which were two great ornaments of the kingdom, he granted to it certain lands and houses situated without the Rottenrow port of the burgh, and forty-four acres of land which formerly belonged to the sub-dean of Glasgow, but were then at the disposal of His Majesty by virtue of the Act of Annexation of Church Lands to the Crown, which lands and others he incorporated into one tenandry, to be called the Tenandry of Ratonraw. For these lands, &c., the burgh was bound to pay to the Crown thirty-six shillings and eight pence Scots as the ancient feu farm, which the

¹ Convention Records, II., p. 418. See Privy Council Register, X., 137.

² Privy Council Register, X., p. 137.

The Council Records of Glasgow from 28th August, 1613, till 30th September, 1623, are awanting.

³ Convention Records, II., p. 344.

⁴ Privy Council Register, XIV., p. 624.

sub-deans had been in use to pay, and three shillings and four pence Scots in augmentation of the royal rental, at the terms of Whitsunday and Martinmas, by equal portions, and to the University and Craft Hospital the rents and duties due and wont in name of feu farm.¹

On 27th January, 1614, Dumbarton represented to the privy council that, of the taxation, granted by parliament to that burgh, £212 Scots—the proportion payable by the earldom and bishopric of Orkney—had not been paid, by reason of the earl of Orkney, sheriff of the county, who should have collected the sum, being in ward, and his successor in the charge of the Islands having no authority to deal with the matter. The privy council was therefore craved to authorise the acting sheriff to collect the taxation and pay over the proceeds to Dumbarton. The authority was accordingly given.² At the convention on 8th July, 1615, the accounts connected with the works at Dumbarton were submitted, along with a report by auditors, which was approved, and it was found that the "compters" were "superexpendit in the soum of £3,101 2s. 4d.", and that the receipts included a sum of 12,000 merks "resavit by his Majesties special direcroctione from his Hienes reseavers in this kingdome in recompense of thair superexpenses." But the two collectors of the taxation "oblisit themselves never to burdein the burrowes with the superexpenses of thair compts in na tyme heirafter."³

On 9th July, 1612, Glasgow applied to the convention for a license to impetrake an impost of ten shillings on every boat and bark coming to the burgh, but its disposal was continued to the next general convention.⁴ It was again continued on 9th July, 1613.⁵ But on 7th July, 1614, the convention authorised Glasgow to "impetrake" from the King a gift for taking four pennies of each load of herring coming along its bridge belonging to unfreemen, and that in addition to the four pennies which were previously leviable—this authority to endure for five years, and the proceeds to be applied in repairing the bridge.⁶ No reference is made in this act to the application for assistance in improving the channel of the river. Whether this may have arisen from the fact that Renfrew and Dumbarton as well as Glasgow had been giving attention to the matter is possible, but it is said that in 1612 these burghs combined to form a passage through a sandbank at Dumbuck Ford, and several weeks were spent on the work. The instructions given by the town council of Glasgow at that time have been already referred to.

On 11th August, 1614, King James VI. granted another charter to Renfrew,

¹ Great Seal Register, VII., p. 351, No. 965. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., pp. 284-291, No. 94. These lands had previously been conveyed or let to various persons, so that the ground rents only were carried to the town by this charter. Glasgow Charters, II., p. 621, No. 59. See also rental, *Ibid.*, p. 430. Glasgow Records, III., p. 503.

² Privy Council Register, X., p. 824.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II., p. 418.

³ Convention Records, III., p. 16.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II., p. 454.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II., p. 356.

by which he confirmed to it the charters by King Robert, dated 10th November, 1313, and by King James VI., with consent of the Regent Earl of Morton, dated 5th February, 1575, and of new granted and confirmed to it the burgh as a royal burgh, with its common lands, including the little island or sands, commonly called the "Langedeggren," and whole liberties and privileges, including a right of ferry on the Clyde between Marlingford and the mouth of the Gryff (Black Cart), a free port, a harbour and haven (as Edinburgh had in Leith), fishing in the river, various specified duties to be drawn at the harbour and applied to its repair, and a right to levy customs on the Clyde.¹

On 21st March, 1617, James VI. granted a charter to Rutherglen, by which, referring to its erection by Kings David, William, Alexander, Robert, and James V. as a royal burgh, he ratified all its rights and infestments, and specially the charter by James V., of date 12th June, 1542, confirming the charter by King David; he of new gave to the magistrates, &c., of the burgh, the burgh, with all its lands and rights therein enumerated, authorised magistrates to be elected, with the usual liberties and privileges belonging to royal burghs, a merchant guild, weekly market on Saturday, and two annual fairs—Luke's Day (18th October) and Trinity Sunday.²

On 5th July, 1617, the convention of burghs (1) granted license to Dumbarton to impetrare from the King a specified impost, to begin at the expiry of the gift granted on 13th August, 1607, to endure for nineteen years thereafter, and to be applied in preserving the town from inundation by the water of Leven; (2) authorised Irvine to apply to the King for an impost, to be taken only from unfreemen, and to endure for five years, on the several descriptions of goods and animals brought into the burgh, to be applied in repairing its harbour and calsays;³ and on 10th July the privy council empowered the magistrates to levy the impost.⁴

On the same day Dumbarton craved license from the convention to impetrare a gift of an impost to be taken of every unfreeman's fishing and coper [dealer's] boat, yearly, fishing and coping herring within and on this side of the Cloch in Clyde and lewis [lochs] lying within the Cloch. The commissioners of Glasgow and Renfrew, however, objected, and all the parties were ordered to appear at the next convention with their respective rights.⁵ Dumbarton also complained against Renfrew for suffering outland burgesses to trade and traffic and usurp the liberties of free burghs.⁶

¹ This charter, which is not now extant, was probably that referred to in the Great Seal Register, IX., p. 709, No. 1906. It, with the two others above referred to, were ratified by parliament on 17th November, 1641. 1641, c. 203. Acts of Parliament, V., p. 456. New Statistical Account of Scotland, vol. VII., p. 16.

² Great Seal Register, VII., p. 584, No. 1618. Municipal Corporation Reports (1835), II., p. 371.

³ Convention Records, III., pp. 47-48.

⁴ Privy Council Register, XI., p. 179.

⁵ Convention Records, III., p. 48.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III., p. 48.

On 23rd December, King James, who was then contemplating a visit to Scotland, wrote to the magistrates and council of Glasgow intimating his intentions, and mentioning that, with a view to securing that everything should be done to support the honour and credit of Scotland in connection with the royal visit, he had ordered a convention of estates to be held at Edinburgh on 5th March next, and he desired that a commissioner from Glasgow should be present.¹ He subsequently seems to have had a good deal of correspondence with Glasgow as to disputes then prevalent as to the election of its magistrates and councillors, and the rights of merchants and tradesmen in the administration of the town. In one letter, dated 22nd September, 1617, he called attention to the differences which existed in the burgh twelve years previously in regard to the inequality of merchants and craftsmen on the council, and the beneficial effect of his order that one-half should be merchants and one-half craftsmen in future. He was informed, however, that this arrangement, which had conduced to good order and peace and quietness, was being disturbed by the action of "turbulent heads" among them, who were endeavouring to alter the method prescribed by him. He therefore required his former order to be observed.²

At the time when the impost authorised in April, 1600, for the support of Glasgow bridge was about to expire, and its continuance was found to be necessary, the town council, apparently towards the end of 1617, petitioned the privy council for a prolongation of the grant. In their petition the grounds on which the original grant had been obtained were stated to be that the bridge, "which was one of the most remarkable monuments in the kingdom," had been so injured by the inundation and violence of the river as to be in great danger of entire destruction; that various parts of the river below the bridge had become so overblown with sand as to have become unnavigable for boats and small vessels, by which the commodities of the city were, for the most part, brought to and from it; that the city was at the time unable to repair the bridge; that the town council had accordingly been allowed by the King to levy an impost for nineteen years on all goods carried across the bridge, and "lossit and laidnit" within the freedom of the city; that this tax and "verie great sums yearlie upliftit be voluntair contributions within the citio" had been expended, the bridge well helped, the sands of the river removed, and causeways formed along the green upon the water side; but that the expense of maintaining these works was now so heavy that the town council were compelled to seek relief. On considering this application the privy council, on 5th February, 1618, extended for five years, after the expiry of the nineteen years specified in the former grant, the power to levy the impost thereby authorised.³

On 8th July, 1618, Renfrew was ordained to cause certain of its alleged burgesses to reside within the burgh, and to institute proceedings against those

¹ Glasgow Records, I., p. 339.

² Glasgow Records, I., pp. 339-40.

³ Privy Council Register, XI., p. 304. Glasgow Charters, I., part ii., pp. 300-2, No. 98.

who were not burgesses, but engaged in trade in Kilmalcolm, Greenock, and other unfree places.¹ Nothing farther on the subject appears in the records of the convention.

In the early part of 1619 Patrick Maxwell of Newark instituted legal proceedings against the town council of Glasgow, setting forth that some of the citizens who traded in merchandise and shipping, unwarrantably, and to his annoyance, discharged their commodities on his land, and committed other acts of "oppression" upon him. They were accordingly obliged to find security that the subject of complaint would not be continued. Under these circumstances the town council applied to the privy council for relief, averring that the relations between them and Maxwell were friendly, and that he had no ground to fear oppression from it or from the citizens. In times of storm and severe weather, no doubt, some Glasgow fishing boats and small vessels sought shelter in his harbours, as all harbours and ports in the kingdom afforded similar shelter to strangers. If, however, any citizen failed in his duty, Maxwell should proceed against the defaulter, and not against the community, which had nothing to do with the matter. Parties were heard before the privy council on 25th February, 1619, and the proceedings complained of were suspended.² No farther reference to this dispute occurs, and it was probably arranged amicably.

On 30th January, 1621, the privy council passed an act for the revival and improvement of pearl fishing in the Scottish rivers, and granted commission to certain gentlemen to see that its terms were observed in specified waters.³ This was followed by an act on 27th March, 1621,⁴ and by another on 26th February, 1622,⁵ which nominated seven new commissioners to superintend pearl fishing in these waters. James Kennedy, of Culleane, was commissioner to superintend and preserve the pearl fishing of the waters of Ayr, Irvine, Girvan, and their branches, and Sir George Elphinstone of Blythswood was appointed to preserve the waters of the Clyde and its branches.⁶

On 7th August, 1621, the archbishop of Glasgow dispensed to Ludovick duke of Lennox the office of bailiary and justiciary of the barony and regality of Glasgow, with all the privileges and immunities, fees, casualties, and duties in any way pertaining, used and wont, to that office,⁷ and that charter was, on 1st April, 1629, confirmed by King Charles I.⁸

At this time the mercantile enterprise which has since been so remarkably developed in Glasgow was evidenced in the action of one of its burgesses of the merchant rank, who, in 1621 and 1622, imported on his own account from Flanders

¹ Convention Records, III., p. 57.

² Privy Council Register, XI., pp. 522-523.

³ *Ibid.*, XII., pp. 408-410.

⁴ *Ibid.*, XII., p. 458.

⁵ *Ibid.*, XII., pp. 660-661.

⁶ *Ibid.* See Domestic Annals of Scotland, I., pp. 513-514.

⁷ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., pp. 314-322, No. 101.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I., ii., pp. 325-7, No. 103.

goods of the value of more than three thousand pounds Scots. He also imported on behalf of others merchandise of considerable value.¹

On 18th June, 1622, Renfrew complained to the privy council against Glasgow for having oppressed the body of the burgh, consisting for the most part of seafaring men haunting the trade of fishing in the West Isles and seas of the kingdom, during 1619, 1620, and 1621, in the exercise of their fishing industry and commerce, by exacting, without authority, an extraordinary impost of 32s. upon every inhabitant of Renfrew repairing with herring and fish to Glasgow bridge for sale, estimated to extend to £35 12s. each yearly; that this was the greatest taxation levied in the kingdom, either by the King or otherways, and that it had been uplifted from more than three score men of Renfrew, making about £1,300 yearly; that for payment of this impost Glasgow not only arrested the boats but poinded the fish of the complainers. In defence it was stated that "couperis" who so brought herrings to the bridge "wailled" them after they were brought from the fishermen, kept the choicest and best for their own use, and brought the smaller fish to Glasgow for the supply of the city and country, and sold them at as high prices as if they had not been "wailled." To prevent this the magistrates of Glasgow enacted that, before such fish were brought to the bridge, the sellers should make oath that the herring had not been "wailled," and that until such oath was made the water bailie should fence the herring "both of frie and unfrie boats," and that the penalty of failure to comply with this order should be £5. In terms of this act, passed on 4th October, 1589, and renewed on 1st August, 1613, the magistrates of Glasgow had summoned the pursuers, "but had dealt with them more favourably than the acts prescribed." As the result of this complaint, the lords, on 18th June, found that the acts complained of "were well made to prevent an abuse, and must remain in force." The penalty for contravention, however, was ordered to be imprisonment in the tolbooth of Glasgow. The infliction of a pecuniary penalty was prohibited.²

In August, 1623, Peter Garbrandston, a Freisland merchant, of the ship "The Young Tobias," of Henloupen, brought his ship, laden with deals, to the port of Inchgreen, having sold the cargo to Glasgow. While being unloaded there, the magistrates of Dumbarton, accompanied by twenty-four or thirty persons armed, boarded the vessel, and, carrying him to Dumbarton, imprisoned him in the tolbooth. They also broke open the doors of his ship, and took away seventy deals. The town-clerk of Glasgow then became cautioner, to the amount of 300 marks, that Garbrandstoun would answer for any wrong which he had done, and would also appear before the privy council on the 20th of that month, and insist in his complaint. On that day, accordingly, he insisted on his charge. Dumbarton

¹ MacLeod's Ancient Records of Dumbartonshire, p. 17. Among the goods imported from Flanders into Ayr between 1617 and 1621 are lasts of soap, hops, lit (new lit, orchard lit), hards, and cairds (Halyburton, Pref., p. c.). These articles were imported in four Ayr ships.

² Privy Council Register, XII., pp. 741-2.

pleaded that the merchant had, without making lawful entry of his goods, "broken bulk, and sold part of them to unfreemen, contrary to law and the freedom of the burgh." They also explained the other charges. The lords, however, found that "the pursuer was detained in ward the first night he was committed, although he offered caution, and that the defenders refused to accept it;" for this wrong-doing they ordered the defenders to pay the pursuer £20 for his expenses during the night of his imprisonment, forbidding them to leave Edinburgh till the money was paid. Further, understanding from "the verbal discourses passed betwixt the parties, and between Gabriel Cunningham, bailie, and John Thomson, clerk of the city of Glasgow," who, in name of that city, assisted the pursuer, that the pursuer's remaining in ward after the first night "proceeded upon some information sent to him by some of the magistrates of Glasgow," the lords decreed Cunningham, in name of the city of Glasgow, to pay £3 to every one of the witnesses in the case."¹

¹ Privy Council Register, XIII., 327, 333-5.

IV.

REIGN OF KING CHARLES I., 1625-49.

On 5th May, 1627, a Dutch ship laden with deals arrived in the Clyde, and the owner of the cargo offered to sell them to Glasgow, notwithstanding the old agreement which required such articles to be sold equally between Glasgow and Dumbarton. Thereupon Dumbarton, holding the ship to be within the liberty and privilege of the burgh, caused it to be arrested, and required the owner to find caution not to violate these, but to pay the petty custom of his ship, and anchorage if the deals were sold. On the 7th Glasgow explained that the deals had been offered to it before the ship came within the liberties of the river, and, having been so bought, were at its disposal. Nevertheless it offered to give Dumbarton one-half of the purchase, and asked it to send up a commissioner to Glasgow to satisfy the merchant for the price. To this communication Dumbarton replied that—"The ship came within the river Clyde, at leist verrie near the samyn, and was bound thairto; that by the order observed betuixt the burghs, it had been the form that the toun of Glasgow sould send down its commissioner, and with the commissioner of Dumbarton visit the goods, and ascertain thair worth and availl, and thereafter pass togidder and buy the same equally." The ship and goods were, it said, at the time at Dumbarton Castle. Glasgow was therefore required to send down a commissioner, otherwise it would be guilty of forestalling. On the following day Jacob Obies, the merchant, appeared in the tolbooth of Dumbarton, and offered to sell the deals equally between Glasgow and Dumbarton, at a specified price, but his offer was declined. Therefore the magistrates required Obies to find caution to answer before them for such wrong done or begun, and for payment of the petty custom of his ship and anchorage, if he sold the cargo. Caution having been so found, Obies became bound to relieve the cautioner.¹

The encroachments on the privileges of royal and free burghs by unfree burghs, and persons who were not resident burgesses of the former, were the

¹ Dumbarton Records, pp. 12, 13. Irving's Dumbartonshire, pp. 474 5.

The mischievous results of over legislation, says Mr. Joseph Irving, are probably more apparent in the case of Dumbarton than any other Scottish burgh of the time, from the circumstance that she was by her charter of confirmation not only empowered to levy

subject of constant complaint at meetings of the convention of burghs, and by its orders were frequently given to all the royal burghs to enforce their rights in their several localities. But the proceedings so ordered failed to effect their object, and the invasion of their chartered rights was aggravated by the creation from time to time of burghs of barony and regality, with powers of trade which seemed to give, at least, *prima facie* rights of trade, which were exercised to the increasing injury of the royal and free burghs. How to deal with this state of matters most effectively was the subject of much deliberation. An act of convention on 4th July, 1627, sets forth as follows:—Finding that the burghs of free royalty daily decrease and yet underlie the whole common burdens of the realm with the rest of the estates, and that burghs of barony and regality are subject to no burden, and to the effect that the questions between the royal burghs and them may be brought to an end sometime, it is thought expedient that, for the better knowledge of the differences of these liberties, such royal burghs as have obtained decrees against burghs of barony and regality or their inhabitants shall produce them to the clerk before 24th August next, with a copy of the charter conferring any particular liberty. That officer was thereupon instructed to investigate the whole subject, and if the King should come to Scotland before the next convention, or if the convention should have occasion to send to court, Edinburgh was appointed to summon certain burghs to consider as to the action to be taken under the advice of the best lawyer.¹

At the convention on 5th July, 1627, a complaint by the fleshers of Glasgow against Dumbarton, for exacting from them eight pence of custom on every cow, ox, mare, or staig coming through it or its liberties, was continued till the next convention in July, 1628, when it was withdrawn.²

On 9th July, 1627, Dumbarton, on a complaint that Glasgow took half a mark yearly off each boat and four pennies off every thousand of herring, “fyve hering everie voyage, of ilk laid or draught geir sax d. or thereby,” ordained the exaction to be questioned at the next convention.³ On 31st January, 1628,

dues upon all vessels entering the Clyde, but it was incumbent upon every master to enter his ship at the port of Dumbarton and give the first offer of her cargo to the burgesses of that place. This, as might be expected, gave rise to endless attempts for eluding both the one impost and the other. Glasgow claimed, and ultimately secured, an exemption so far as her own burgesses were concerned, but as they had every interest to increase the trade of their own port, they sought practically to extend the exemption to every captain with whom they traded and every vessel with which they had the remotest connection. The actions in the Records regarding offences of this description would fill many pages. At one time it is “Glasgow to be resisted,” then it is “a commissioner to be sent to Glasgow,” next there is “Action to be raised against the town of Glasgow,” till at length the incident in dispute becomes lost in a lengthy “Report from the town’s agent in Edinburgh anent the action against Glasgow,” then raging with full fury in the law courts (Preface to Dumbarton Burgh Records, pp. 9, 10).

¹ Convention Records, III., pp. 244, 245. ² *Ibid.*, pp. 250, 269.

³ Dumbarton Records, p. 17. Irving’s Dumbartonshire, p. 479. The earliest existing

a Dutch ship having arrived at Newark laden with wine, and a part of the cargo having been discharged, Dumbarton ordered the ship to be arrested and the sailors to be taken from it;¹ and on 17th June directed its commissioner to the convention of burghs to take with him the burgh's charter declaring the burgh to be free of custom throughout the kingdom. It also resolved (1) to renew its application for an extension of the impost formerly granted, leviable as well from "freemen and unfree," and to renounce the license and gift granted; and (2) to apply for a new license to impetrare a gift of 8d. for each cow, ox, mare, staig, and horse coming through its bounds to be sold as well by freemen as unfree.²

On 1st July, 1628, the condition of the "water works" at Dumbarton was exercising the care of the magistrates of the burgh, who ordered certain operations to be proceeded with. In this work men and women were engaged.³ In order to meet the necessary expense, the convention of burghs was petitioned to sanction an application for an impost for a period of nineteen years, and on the 3rd it gave license to the burgh to impetrare the gift of an impost on goods entering the burgh for repairing and protecting it from the violence of the water.⁴ The necessity for operations being immediately commenced, however, induced the council, on 18th July, "to erect a water gang on the south side of the Leven for the safety of the town, to convey the water off the Clunypark and head of the upper work." The town was accordingly divided, and the inhabitants of the eastern half were ordered to attend on the following Monday, with spades and shovels, and commence the necessary operations. The inhabitants of the western half were ordered to attend in like manner on the following day, for the same purpose. Those who failed so to attend were subjected to an unlaw of a day's wage.⁵ The privy council, however, being careful to understand the true estate of the town, and whether necessity existed for granting the impost, appointed Lord Rosse and John Colquhoun of Luss to inspect the works and report their opinion.⁶ On 3rd September they separately reported that, if the water works were not repaired and supported, they could not stand.⁷ On 22nd September the magistrates forwarded this report to the privy council, and appealed to it for help.⁸ Thereupon the privy council, on 27th September, granted an impost for nineteen years, to be employed

volume of the Council Records of Dumbarton extends from April, 1627, to January, 1641; the 2nd volume contains such minutes as exist between April, 1655, and March, 1669; the 3rd extends from 1673 till 1693, and is succeeded by a regular series of minutes.

¹ Dumbarton Records, p. 24; Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 486.

² Dumbarton Records, p. 27; Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 489.

³ Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 490.

⁴ Convention Records, III., pp. 270, 271.

⁵ Dumbarton Records, p. 28. MacLeod's Ancient Records of Dumbarton, pp. 26, 27, 28. The wages paid to each person engaged in the work were 50d. Scots to men and 40d. to women (Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 490).

⁶ Privy Council Register, 2nd series, II., pp. 377, 380.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II., 626. MacLeod's Ancient Records of Dumbartonshire, p. 27.

⁸ *Ibid.*, II., 627.

in protecting the burgh from the inundation of the waters, as the same had been granted by the King on 10th September, 1600, for seven years, and extended for nineteen years on 13th August, 1607.¹

In 1630 King Charles I. determined to establish on the West of Scotland a common fishery, which would be a nursery of seamen and increase the shipping and trade in all parts of his dominions. But the royal burghs strove hard to prevent this invasion of what they conceived to be one of their privileges in respect of the national burdens they had to bear. All, however, that they could get, as regarded the West of Scotland, was a royal letter prohibiting fishing on the coast between the Mull of Galloway and Kintyre, or in any place within the same, "except natives, according to the ancient custom." This exemption was granted on the ground that many of his subjects dwelling on the bounds adjacent to the river and firth of Clyde had been at all times, and still were, at some seasons of the year, chiefly maintained by the fishings there, as serving for their necessary use, so that they could hardly subsist without them.²

On each of 27th April and 8th July, 1630, Dumbarton and Glasgow entered into a contract for the joint purchase of a cargo.³

On 27th October, 1631, the magistrates of Dumbarton met with those of Renfrew, when the latter produced a "testimonial" by the lord chamberlain in relation to controversies between the two burghs, setting forth that they had been required to appear in a court held by him at Glasgow on 22nd November, 1429; that at this court these controversies were submitted to an assize which found that Renfrew was in possession of the schotts of the fishing of the sand-bed and of the mid stream of the water of Clyde to the Blackstaine, and of the customs and anchorage within themselves, and from thence furth down, the rest debateable to belong equally and be divided betwixt Dumbarton and Renfrew; that this testimonial was not subscribed, but had certain bits of old seals attached, which were said to be the seal of the chamberlain and certain of the assize, and was dated at Edinburgh the — day of January, 1429. The laird of Greenock had, however, summoned Dumbarton and Renfrew to produce their rights by which they took from his men customs of the corn brought into the Clyde from Ireland. He also alleged that till within "the last half-year" Renfrew had never exercised the right claimed under this testimonial or decreet. It was, therefore, resolved to instruct counsel and agents in Edinburgh to advise as to the action to be taken.⁴ On 20th October, Dumbarton resolved to consult the town's lawyers in Edinburgh as to the action of Renfrew in taking up customs at Kilpatrick, though the former burgh had been "ever in possession of the haill customs in Clyde."⁵ As the result

¹ Privy Council Register, 2nd series, II., p. 466.

² Glasgow Charters, I., i., p. 324.

³ Dumbarton Records, pp. 33-4. Irving's Dumbartonshire, pp. 495, 496.

⁴ Dumbarton Records, p. 36. Irving's Dumbartonshire, pp. 498, 499.

⁵ Dumbarton Records, p. 37. Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 499.

possibly of this consultation, Dumbarton, on 4th June, 1632, ordered a complaint against Renfrew to be sent in to the convention of burghs.¹

The council records of Glasgow contain no further information as to the operations of the burgh on the Clyde till 11th June, 1631, when the treasurer was authorised to have a warrant for 300 merks disbursed to "the laird of Kelburne for his supply to the building of ane pier at the Kelburne fute, quhilk may be steddable to the merchants of this burghe."² On 13th August, 1631, the treasurer was authorised to have a warrant for £66 12s. Scots [£5 11s. sterling] disbursed by him to workmen "who wrought at the new haven on Clyde, for helping thereof;" and seven days later, £40 15s. 6d. Scots [£3 7s. 11d. sterling] were paid to workmen who wrought on the river on the 15th and 16th of the month, and for bread and drink given them while engaged in mending the new haven.³ On 12th November in the same year a warrant was granted to the treasurer for £27 12s. Scots [£2 6s. sterling] for fifty-four creels and two barrows furnished by him at the command of the provost for "mending the water of Clyde."⁴ On 9th June, 1632, the treasurer was authorised to have a warrant for £129 1s. 8d. Scots [£10 15s. 1d. sterling] expended on the water from 24th May to 9th June, and on 23rd June a warrant for £197 8s. 4d. Scots [£16 9s. sterling] disbursed by him for the "wark of the water fra the 14th day of June instant to this day at nycht;"⁵ and on 22nd September in the same year a similar warrant was ordered to be given him for £84 15s. 4d. Scots [£7 1s. 3d. sterling] disbursed by him in complete payment of the whole expenditure upon "the helping of the water this year bygane, except John Bairdis compt, quhilk is not as yet given in for the creills and sume small tymmer."⁶

On 28th June, 1633, two acts of parliament were passed, the first of which, in consideration of the expense incurred by Glasgow in making the Clyde navigable, in maintaining the bridge and the cathedral, and in building a tolbooth and churches, confirmed all the charters and evidents granted to the city, without prejudice (1) to the right of the dukes of Lennox in their office of bailiary and justiciary of the barony and regality of Glasgow; (2) to that of the archbishop as to electing and nominating the magistrates of the burgh; and (3) to the liberties, privileges, and immunities of the University.⁷ The second, in favour of the burgh of Dumbarton, confirmed a charter by King James VI., dated 10th June 1618.⁸

On the same day an act of parliament ratified the privileges of the free

¹ Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 501. MacLeod's Ancient Records of Dumbarton, pp. 72, 73.

² Glasgow Records, II., p. 4. Kelly Burn joined the firth at Wemyss Bay.

³ Glasgow Records, II., p. 6. The precise position of this new haven has not been ascertained.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II., p. 8.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II., p. 11.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II., p. 13.

⁷ 1633, c. 79. Acts of Parliament, V., pp. 87-89. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., pp. 351, 355, No. 106.

⁸ 1639, c. 90. Acts of Parliament, V., p. 101.

royal burghs, and especially the Acts 1466, c. 1,¹ 1503, c. 27 and 29,² 1592, c. 74,³ and 1563, c. 24,⁴ and declared the liberties and privileges mentioned in these acts to be competent only to free royal burghs that had vote in parliament and bore burden with the rest of these burghs. All others were prohibited from using and exercising these liberties and privileges, and letters of horning were ordained to be directed by the lords of council at the instance of all burghs upon these privileges and acts of parliament made thereupon.⁵

Further payments by Glasgow in connection with the operations on the Clyde were continued on 6th July, 1633, when a payment by the treasurer of £140 Scots [£11 13s. 4d. sterling] to John Baird was allowed.⁶ On 17th August again he had a warrant for £296 6s. 10d. Scots [£24 13s. 10d. sterling] disbursed for mending the river,⁷ and on 5th October another warrant for £50 13s. 4d. Scots [£4 4s. 5d. sterling] disbursed "for help of the river and uther the tounes affairs" from 28th September to the date of the order.⁸

As a specimen of the kind of dealing known as forestalling and regratting, against which the old laws of burghs were directed, the records of Dumbarton afford an illustration on 7th September, 1633. On that day William Colquhoun, in Kilpatrick, was challenged at the instance of the procurator-fiscal of the burgh for forestalling and regratting corn and oats coming by sea within the Clyde, specially at Kilpatrick.⁹ The offence charged was that he and his partners bought "divers and sundrie barks" and boatsfull of oats, by giving arles and goods pennies, and thereafter, before receipt or delivery or measuring the corn, sold the same over again to others in the same place and within the same vessel, taking six shillings or thereby of profit of each boll. Colquhoun was ordained to pass into ward till he found caution to abide the issue of an assize.¹⁰

On 16th December, 1633, a communication from Glasgow to Dumbarton intimated that John Shaw, laird of Greenock, was attempting to get that town erected into a burgh of barony, with a weekly market, and two yearly fairs, and to have it constituted a free port, with customs, tolls, and dock mails. This attempt both burghs determined to resist, and a communication was ordered to be sent to Renfrew that it might also oppose. The provost of Dumbarton was also instructed to proceed to Edinburgh for the same purpose.¹¹ On 1st February, 1634, Glasgow appointed the town-clerk and another to proceed to Edinburgh and oppose

¹ Acts of Parliament, II., p. 86.

⁵ 1633, c. 24. Acts of Parliament, V., p. 42.

² *Ibid.*, II., pp. 245-252.

⁶ Glasgow Records, II., p. 15.

³ *Ibid.*, III., p. 578.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II., p. 15.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II., p. 543.

⁸ *Ibid.*, II., p. 18.

⁹ Forestallers and regratters, says Sir George Mackenzie, are ordinarily taken for one and the same, yet there is this difference between them that regratters are only those who buy goods that they may sell them again at a dearer rate, but forestallers are such as buy goods before they come to an open market (Works, II., p. 141).

¹⁰ Dumbarton Records, pp. 41, 42.

¹¹ Irving's Dumbarton Records, p. 505.

Shaw's application, which was to be heard by the Lords of Exchequer on the 8th.¹ The ground on which opposition was to be offered was that, while Greenock had been erected a burgh of barony, it should have no right to enjoy liberties belonging to free royal burghs against the laws and acts of parliament; nor should it pretend to any right to the customs of the water of Clyde, and its duties "in any sort." Negotiations afterwards took place to effect an arrangement with Greenock, in which Archibald lord of Lorne took a prominent part. The representative of Dumbarton to the convention was also instructed to do what he could to oppose the application of Greenock.² Several meetings appear to have taken place afterwards with Greenock, and also with Lord Lorne, but the ultimate result is not recorded.

At this time the action of the water of Leven on the property of the burgh of Dumbarton was causing anxiety. On 23rd June, 1634, the visitors reported that the water work was in great danger of being undermined and broken through, and that the water of Leven was so encroaching on the bulwark that, if allowed to proceed forty feet further, the damage would be irremediable. The provost was therefore recommended to consult the master of work in Beith as to how the threatened danger should be guarded against. Repairs on the bulwarks were immediately ordered.³ Disputes with Glasgow were at the same time occupying the attention of the council, for on 12th November instructions were given by it to get the action of reduction and improbation in dependence between it and the city "discussed and ended."⁴ But it appears to have been in suspense on 1st April, 1635, when a summons of suspension was ordered to be raised against Glasgow for the customs and impost exacted from the freemen of Dumbarton.⁵

¹ Glasgow Records, II., p. 19.

² Irving's Dumbarton Records, p. 507.

³ MacLeod's Ancient Records of Dumbarton, pp. 24, 25. Irving's Dumbarton Records, p. 506.

⁴ Irving's Dumbarton Records, pp. 507-8.

⁵ The value of Dumbarton's petty customs, &c., at this time is thus stated—

"The laidill dewtie, pettie customes, misrage, weyage, assize boll of aittis, beir and siklyke small guidds within burgh, and cumand within the river Leuyn, with the ankorage of small bottis without mastis were let to John Clerk, wright, for £116 Scots;

"The impost within burgh and water of Levin, grantit be his Majestie for the water wark, set to Robert Sempill, fyscher, for £21 10s.;

"The grass of the Braidmeadow let for £14 6s.;

"The pettie customes on Clyd were set for 100 merks; and

"The pettie customes and impost of horses and guidis were set to Johne Lindesay for £80."

(Irving's Dumbarton Records (1860), pp. 46, 47).

On 2nd April, 1636, the magistrates of Dumbarton appointed the proceedings as to the petty customs of Clyde to be resisted.¹

On 5th June, 1635, King Charles I., as tutor administrator and governor to his son Charles, Prince of Scotland and Wales, Duke of Rothesay, &c., granted a charter to John Shaw, of Greenock, and Helen Houston, his spouse, and longest liver of them, in conjunct fee and life-rent, and their heirs male, of the lands of Wester Greenock, and others therein specified,² and erected the town or village of that name into a free burgh of barony, to be called the burgh of Greenock, with all the usual privileges and immunities, and conferred on the grantees power to nominate bailies and officers of court, to have a prison, and to levy the dues exigible in a burgh of barony. It granted the privilege and liberty of a weekly market and two yearly free fairs, and all other liberties, privileges, and jurisdictions belonging to any other free burgh of barony within the kingdom; it also authorised the inhabitants to be received and admitted free burgesses by the superior, with the various privileges of trade therein specified.³

¹ Irving's Dumbarton Records, p. 50.

² Municipal Corporation Reports, II., p. 57.

Greenock belonged to the Galbraiths, a Lennox family. Malcolm de Galbraith, of Greenock, had two daughters, one of whom carried Wester Greenock to Shaw, and the other Easter Greenock to Thomas Crawford, of Auchinames. The descent of Easter Greenock is obscure, but it eventually vested in Sir John Crawford, Bart., of Kilbirnie, whose eldest daughter married, in 1659, Sir Archibald Stewart, first baronet of Blackhall, and his youngest daughter married, in 1664, the Hon. Patrick Lindsay, son of the earl of Crawford.

³ This charter is not printed in the Great Seal Register, but it was ratified by the Scottish Parliament on 17th November, 1641. 1641, c. 181. Acts of Parliament, vol. V., p. 440. This act ratified the grant of the lands of Wester Greenock and others "with the new erection contained in the said charter of the town or village of Greenock in ane free burgh of barony to be called now and in all time coming the burgh of Greenock, with all privileges, liberties, and immunities at length mentioned and contained in the said charter."

Both Mr. Williamson and Mr. Campbell refer to harbours at Greenock previous to this time. Mr. Campbell states that a pier was built by John Shaw shortly after he received the first charter in 1635. It appears, he says, to have been the first landing-place at Wester Greenock; to have been constructed of drystone work—masonry without mortar; and to have extended a considerable distance into the bay (*Sketches of Greenock*, I., p. 65). But Mr. Brown questions this, and refers to a statement by Lady Shaw, who was conversant with the affairs of the town, to the effect that "there was no harbour in Wester Greenock in 1700 but a heap of whinstones for shading the fishers' boats and small barques; and that the bay was the only protection that small vessels had to anchor in close to the town" (*Early Annals of Greenock*, p. 77). In his Lives of Boulton and Watt Smiles accepts this statement. The prosperity of Greenock, he says, "dates from the year 1707. Before that time there was no pier—only a rude landing stage which Sir John Shaw had provided for his barge in the 'Little Bay.' Vessels of burden requiring to load or unload their cargoes did so at the pier at Cartsdyke. From this pier the first Clyde ship which crossed the Atlantic sailed for Darien in 1697" (chap. V., pp. 80-5).

On 23rd June, 1634, the commissioner of Dumbarton to the convention was instructed, in

On 25th November, 1635, the town council of Glasgow, considering the great contempt into which the place of water bailie had fallen by the admission to it of divers decayed and depauperate persons, and the great prejudice which thereby resulted, and being most anxious “to redact the same to the old worthy and laudable estate” in which it once was, resolved that one of the best sort and rank of the council should be elected to that office.¹ Accordingly, on 12th December, having under consideration the abuses done on the Clyde, within the liberty of the city, by the inbringers of herring, fishes, and other commodities—which abuses were not dealt with by the water sergeant—they resolved that in future a burgess of good quality should be annually appointed water bailie, on the day on which the dean of guild and deacon-convenor were elected. The power and duty of the water bailie were declared to be, to set down prices upon the killeing (large cod), and take order with and punish the coupers and other sellers of herring and other fishes, and all violators of acts made anent the river, to take caution for the appearance of these violators before the magistrates and himself upon a court day, to be judged by them and him, the unlaws to be applied to pious uses. The water sergeants were required to be obedient and answerable to the water bailie, and to serve him in his office. It was farther resolved that the water bailie should be an ordinary councillor of the burgh yearly during his term of office which should not endure beyond two years; that he should have power to depose the water sergeants on “tryet wraigis,” and also to elect others, with the advice of the magistrates and council; that he should not suffer them to take more than their dues, and that he should cause them to collect and distribute truly the duties of the Leper Hospital beyond the bridge.² On 19th December, Colin Campbell, younger, was elected water bailie for the ensuing year, and he was appointed to receive a yearly fee of £10 Scots, to be paid along with the fees of the provost and bailies.³

On 2nd September, 1636, a complaint was made to the Privy Council by the King’s Advocate, Sir Thomas Hope, and three others, against Dumbarton, “for going out against the master of the ship called the ‘Quihyte Fedder,’ of Amsterdam, boddin in feir of weir, and schooting at him when sailing in Clyd, and carrying him as a prisoner into the town.” It was agreed that the expenses of defending the action should be borne upon the common charge.⁴

the application by Greenock to be erected a burgh of barony, to resist any claim by it to the customs, anchorage, and other privileges of the Clyde belonging to Dumbarton (Dumbarton Records, p. 44).

¹ Glasgow Records, II., p. 35.

² *Ibid.*, p. 37.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁴ Dumbarton Records, p. 50. The complainers were the King’s Advocate, Henrick . . . , master of the ship, James Arnot, merchant, burgess of Edinburgh, and James Bell, merchant, burgess of Glasgow; and the complaint set forth that Arnot and Bell had freighted the “White Feather” from Bordeaux to carry a load of beans to the Clyde, and that on arriving at Inchgreen, within the liberties and privileges of Glasgow, six miles from Dumbarton, on 26th June, she delivered her cargo, and remained there; that Henrick having occasion to go down the river in his “cog boat,” George Hall, burgess of Dumbarton, with others to the

On 16th October, 1636, King Charles I. granted a charter to Glasgow, which proceeds upon the preamble of the ancient erection of the burgh, of its great antiquity, of its integrity and industry in foreign trade, and of the naval enterprise of its merchants and inhabitants, which had increased the royal rents and revenues, and brought wealth and civilisation to that part of the kingdom. Then, describing the city as, at that time and for many ages bypast, the chief and most distinguished burgh in the western part of his kingdom, he alluded to the great sums of money which it had expended for many years in making the Clyde—"on which the city is built and situated"—navigable for ships and vessels, for importation and exportation of home and foreign commodities, to the great comfort of the lieges there, and to those coming to its bounds, and to the adjoining shires; and for mending, repairing, and upholding the bridge over the river, which greatly conduces to the furtherance of traffic, &c. With that preamble he confirmed all the charters, rights, and privileges granted by his predecessors, himself, and others to it, with the freedom, use, and possession which the burgh had in electing a water bailie to have charge of the waters within the Clyde where the sea ebbs and flows, and within the whole bounds thereof below the bridge of Glasgow to the Clochstane, and of correcting all wrongs and outrages committed on the river within these bounds. He of new erected the burgh into a free royal burgh, with all the privileges and immunities, spiritual and temporal, belonging to the same, with power, *inter alia*, to exercise all sorts of merchandise, as well home as foreign, and to have three weekly markets and four free fairs annually. He also granted to the burgh freedom and immunity of the roadsteads of Inschgreen, Newnark, Pot of the Rig, or any other of the roadsteads within the river

number of 22 persons, all armed with muskets, hagbuts, pistolettes, and other weapons, at the instigation of John Semple, provost of Dumbarton, manned a shallop with warlike provision which they obtained from a Flemish ship lying near the castle of Dumbarton, and fiercely followed Henrick hard by the castle, discharging pistols, slapping the sails of his boat, and compelling him, with four of his mariners, to flee to the said Flemish ship; that Hall and his party entered that ship, put violent hands on Henrick, and carried him a prisoner to Dumbarton and charged him either to go to prison or to pay such sums as they demanded; that not having ready money to give them he was placod for two days in the charge of two of the town's officers, and was only released on payment of 12½ dollars and 12s. Scots for their pretended petty customs for the beans imported by him and for the coals he was to export, and for the anchorage of his ship. All the parties having been called, and appearances made for them, it was agreed to submit the complaint to the arbitration of David, Earl of Southesk, and Archibald, Lord Lorne, and in case of their variance, to John, Earl of Traquair, Lord High Treasurer. These arbiters were ordained to take cognizance of the complaint, and examine witnesses thereon, and as they found the facts demanded to do justice to the parties. It was also remitted to them to prescribe some moderate course by which the customs and duties payable to Dumbarton by strangers and others not burgesses and freemen of the royal burgh might be uplifted. The hearing was appointed to take place on the following day, and parties promised to abide by the decision to be then given (Privy Council Register, 2nd Series, VI., pp. 313-4; Dumbarton Records, p. 50). The award of the arbiters unfortunately is not given.

Clyde, between the bridge of Glasgow and the Clochstane, for loading and unloading merchandise and goods belonging to the burgh and its inhabitants, as well imported as exported by them in ships and other vessels belonging to Scotland or to strangers and foreigners. He, moreover, granted free power, freedom, and privilege to Glasgow, its burgesses and inhabitants, of trade and traffic, selling and making merchandise within all parts of the Clyde with foreigners and all other persons coming and repairing thither; and of building ports and roadsteads, bulwarks and jetty heads, to render the river more navigable within all its bounds from the bridge of Glasgow to the Clochstane,¹ and for receiving these ships, boats, and vessels within the bounds of the river as far as the spring tide flows, and to take stones and sand within any part of the river as far as the spring tide flows for constructing bulwarks, ports, roadsteads, and jetty heads, and to repair and mend the same, and to ballast therewith ships and other vessels, with power to them to exact anchorages and shore silver, and other dues of all merchandise, ccrears, boats, and other vessels landing at the Broomielaw of Glasgow, or at any other place within the Clyde, according to use and wont. This charter was granted subject to the payment by Glasgow to the King and his successors of twenty merks at Whitsunday and Martinmas, by equal portions, in name of burgh maill, with services of burgh used and wont; and to the archbishop of Glasgow and his successors of sixteen merks, to which payment Glasgow was bound by its former charter. It was also expressly provided that this charter, and all that might follow upon it, should nowise prejudice James duke of Lennox and his successors in regard to their freedoms and privileges within the burgh and regality wherein they or their predecessors had been in the previous use and enjoyment.²

¹ Where the Cloch Lighthouse now stands—a distance of 27 miles seaward from the city.

² Great Seal Register, IX., No. 601. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., 375-395, No. 110. Ratified by parliament on 17th November, 1641 [1641, c. 225]; on 20th May, 1661 [1661, c. 235]; and on 23rd December, 1669 [1669, c. 108]. Acts of Parliament, V., 473, and VII., 220, 650.

In 1636 Sir William Brereton, a gentleman of Cheshire, travelled through Scotland, and among "the prime cities in Scotland" mentions "Glasgow, Aire, Dumbarton, Erwine" [Irvine]. Among the "fairest bridges in Scotland" he mentions that of Glasgow, and, he adds, that the Clyde was then navigable within six miles of the city; "it ebbs and flows above the bridge, though now the water is so shallow as you may ride under the horse belly" (*Early Travellers in Scotland*, pp. 151-2). Visiting Irvine he describes it as "daintily situate upon a navigable arm of the sea, and in a dainty, pleasant, level, champaign country; excellent good corn there is near unto it, where the ground is enriched and made fruitful with the sea weeds or lime. Hence," he adds, "they trade much into Bordeaux, in France, and are now furnished with good wine" (*Ibid.*, pp. 155-6). In Ayr, however, he found a better store of shipping than at Irvine. Most inhabitants in the town are "merchants trading unto and bred in France" (*Ibid.*, p. 156). Glasgow he describes as an archbishop's seat, an ancient university, one only college, consisting of about one hundred and twenty students, wherein are four schools, one principal, four regents. There are about six or seven thousand communicants, and about twenty thousand persons in the town, which is famous for the church which is fairest and stateliest in Scotland, for the tolbooth and bridge (*Ibid.*, pp. 150-1).

Dumbarton was informed of the application of Glasgow for this charter, the issuing of which seems to have been delayed till that burgh was heard. Accordingly, on 22nd November, 1636, it appointed commissioners to ride to Edinburgh and oppose its passing. On 19th December their law expenses there were ordered to be paid.¹ On 26th January, 1637, the provost was again directed to proceed to Edinburgh on the business, and on 27th February, 1637, he reported that he had seen the earl of Traquair, lord treasurer, on the subject, and had been shown a bond for preserving the immunities of the duke of Lennox and of Dumbarton. The town council, however, did not consider this sufficient, and decided to raise a summons of reduction.² On the 15th of September the town council appointed a deputation to go to Paisley to meet the duke of Lennox, who was to visit that town, and "petition him for his assistance against Glasgow;"³ and on 20th November they resolved to complain to the convention of burghs, who were to meet on the 28th of that month, against Glasgow "for troubling and molesting it in uplifting the Clyde dues."⁴ It was resolved to produce an inventory of all these dues, and the commissioners were instructed to do all they could to settle peace without prejudice to Dumbarton. With that object, it was indicated that they might condescend Glasgow and its burgesses to be as free as the burgesses of Dumbarton in Clyde, to pay no more custom of any goods brought into Clyde by them on their own adventure, than the freemen and burgesses of Dumbarton pay; and that Glasgow might pay no more custom for any goods brought into Clyde to it, on the adventure of strangers, than strangers brought in by the burgesses of Dumbarton paid for goods brought into the river on the adventure of unfreemen and strangers.⁵

The archbishop and the college seem to have apprehended that the wide terms of this charter might be prejudicial to their interests. Glasgow, therefore, on 6th December, 1636, granted a bond to these parties declaring that the charter should in no respect be prejudicial to them.⁶ In 1636 the first feu on the Greenock estate was granted by John Shaw, but the progress of feuing seems to have been slow, for seventy years afterwards the population both of Greenock and Crawfordsdyke is said not to have exceeded a thousand.

The convention records for 1637 are awanting, but the commissioner for Dumbarton reported to the town council on 14th August, 1638, that the commissioners of Edinburgh, Dundee, Linlithgow, and Irvine had been appointed to see if they could settle the disputes between Glasgow and Dumbarton.⁷

The relation in which Glasgow had hitherto stood to the archbishop in regard to the election of its magistrates was now about to be changed. On 8th

¹ Irving's Dumbarton Records, pp. 51-2.

⁵ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁶ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., 395-397, No. 111.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 53-4.

⁷ Dumbarton Records, p. 56.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

December, 1638, the general assembly of the kirk, assembled in Glasgow, passed an act declaring episcopacy to have been abjured by the Confession of Faith in 1580, and to be removed out of the kirk.¹ On 17th August, 1639, the assembly ordained that episcopal government and the civil place and power of kirkmen be holden still as unlawful in this kirk,² and that ordinance was ratified by parliament on 6th June, 1640, by an act which gave it the strength of a law and act of parliament, and rescinded and annulled all acts and decrees of parliament and council formerly made contrary to and in prejudice thereof.³ The church was also appointed to be governed by assemblies and kirk sessions.

On 6th September, 1641, King Charles I. granted a charter under his privy seal, in which, reciting that by the abolition of episcopacy the temporality of the bishopric of Glasgow was in the Crown, and also reciting the old connection between the family of Lennox and the vassals of the archbishop, he granted to the duke of Lennox and Richmond the lands and barony of Glasgow, the castle, city, burgh, and regality of Glasgow, with the heritable right to nominate and elect the magistrates of the city as amply as had belonged to the archbishop. He also constituted the duke and his successors lords of the regality of Glasgow and Bishopforest, with power of justiciary therein.⁴

An act of parliament, dated 16th November, 1641, empowered Glasgow to elect its magistrates yearly at the accustomed time, as had hitherto been done by the archbishop or the duke of Lennox. It proceeds on the preamble that in the election of these, during the time of episcopacy, the assent of the archbishop was necessary; that, during the time when episcopacy was not allowed, the assent of Ludovick duke of Lennox and Richmond, who was heritably infest in the archbishopric, with the privileges belonging thereto, was required; that now, the burgh being one of the best peopled and prime burghs in the kingdom, it was agreeable to reason that it should have free liberty to choose such persons as should be most fit both to serve the crown and govern the burgh, as other burghs of the kingdom did. The King, therefore, with the advice of the estates and the special consent of James duke of Lennox and Richmond, statuted and ordained that the burgh of Glasgow should, in all time coming, have as free liberty in the election and choosing of its magistrates yearly, at the accustomed times, as any other burgh in the kingdom of Scotland, with this special provision and condition, that the magistrates and council and their successors should be bound to present yearly to the duke or his commissioner, as in place of the archbishop, a leet of three persons to be provost, of whom the duke should select

¹ Acts of the General Assembly (1843), p. 13.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 37. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., 397-400.

³ 1640, c. 19. Acts of Parliament, V., 276. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., 400.

⁴ Glasgow Charters, I., ii., pp. 403-410, No. 115.

This charter was ratified by parliament on 17th November, 1641. 1641, c. 273. Acts of Parliament, V., p. 506.

one to be provost for the year following. If, however, the duke or his commissioner were not at his castle within the burgh during the time of election, the election of magistrates might nevertheless proceed.¹

On the same day another act of parliament ordained all superiorities of lands, &c., formerly held of bishops of Glasgow and their chapters, then abolished, to belong to the Crown, and be held of it conform to the rights of the vassals—the rights of the Duke of Lennox being, however, declared not to be prejudiced.²

The following archbishops and bishops were deposed by the General Assembly, viz.:—Archbishop Spottiswood, of St. Andrews; Archbishop Lindsay, of Glasgow; and Bishops Lindsay, of Edinburgh; Sidserf, of Galloway; Maxwell, of Ross; Whytfoord, of Brechin; Guthry, of Moray; Grahame, of Orkney; Fairlie, of Lismore; Campbell, of the Isles; Lindsay, of Dunkeld; and Abernethy, of Caithness.

On 20th June, 1639, Dumbarton had under consideration a letter from Glasgow intimating that a ship laden with salt had been brought into the Clyde, and that the cargo had been offered for sale to that burgh. Glasgow thereupon invited Dumbarton to send one or more of its councillors to agree with the master of the ship as to the cargo in the best manner for the good of both burghs. Dumbarton, however, found that it was contrary to its liberties, former uses and customs, and the old indenture between the two burghs, inviolably observed heretofore, that Dumbarton should send commissioners to Glasgow to buy any bargain, but, on the contrary, that Glasgow should send down its commissioners before buying any commodity offered by strangers. A letter was thereupon sent to Glasgow to the above effect, and stating that the owner of the salt should go to Dumbarton and offer it there, and that advertisement should afterwards be made to Glasgow on its charges to send down its commissioners to buy the salt for the two burghs.³

On 12th September, 1639, the lords of the articles passed an act declaring Newark and Inchgreen⁴ to be the two places for Glasgow to transport herring.⁵

On 2nd October, 1639, a commission was ordered to be granted to representatives of Greenock and Newark, with the magistrates of Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Renfrew, to see that good boats were provided for the Clyde, and rates fixed for their hire.⁶

On 9th October, 1639, parliament ratified to Dumbarton a decree of double

¹ 1641, c. 103. Acts of Parliament, V., p. 412. App., p. 709. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 410, No. 116.

² 1641, c. 119. Acts of Parliament, V., p. 418. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 411, No. 117.

³ Irving's Dumbarton Records, pp. 59, 60.

⁴ Inchgreen was a small island not far from the shore a little below Newark. Upon it the fishermen of former times repaired their boats and spread their nets; and latterly a powder magazine stood there.

⁵ Acts of Parliament, V., p. 597. Appendix.

⁶ Minutes in the Articles. Acts of Parliament, V., p. 606.

poinding granted by the Lords of Session between it and Renfrew, and this decree was given to the provost and commissioner for Glasgow to be seen.¹ On 16th October the provost was heard, to represent the prejudice which would result from it to his burgh, and produced in writing his reasons against it. These were answered by the provost of Dumbarton, after which both commissioners were appointed to meet with the earls of Argyle, Lauderdale, and Southesk, and to show to them their respective rights and reasons, with a view to their reporting thereon to the lords of the articles.² On 10th October Dumbarton obtained a parliamentary ratification of its three fairs.³ A ratification was ordered to be prepared in favour of Dumbarton and Renfrew on 23rd October.⁴

The commercial development to which reference has been made in 1621 and 1622 was followed up in subsequent years, and before 1640 several Glasgow citizens of the merchant class had by successful trading operations acquired what in those days were large fortunes. Among those mentioned by local historians were Patrick Bell, Colin Campbell of Blythswood, William Anderson of Dovehill, and James Bell.

On 11th August, 1640, the burgh records of Dumbarton refer to "proceedings regarding the purchase of ships laden with Spanish salt, bought by Ayr burgesses, to the prejudice of the town;" and on 7th January, 1641, the commissioner to the convention of burghs then appointed was directed "to get in the rest of the £1,000 unpaid granted to the building of the tolbooth."⁵

The fatuous attempt of Charles I. to impose Episcopacy on Scotland was strenuously resisted by Dumbarton, whose representative Provost Sempill took a prominent part in the movement which resulted in the formation of what was known as the "Tables." In 1639 the castle was held on behalf of the King by Sir William Stewart, who, with his family, proceeded to the parish church on the last Sunday of March—the Sacramental Sabbath. At the conclusion of the service, Sempill caused Stewart to be brought under guard to his house, where he compelled him to authorise the keys of the castle to be delivered to the provost. Possession of the castle was then obtained, and occupied by a portion of the force under Argyll, on behalf of the Covenanters. In terms of the treaty of peace, however, the castle was transferred to the Royalists in 1641. In that year a ship belonging to several Glasgow merchants was ordered by the committee of war to be sunk in the channel of the Clyde, to prevent the King's ships victualling the Castle of Dumbarton. Another ship, belonging to the same owners, was employed, by order of the estates, in watching the movements of the enemy in the western seas, and when so engaged was wrecked on a rock in the entry to Lochaber. The owners accordingly petitioned parliament to give them compensa-

¹ Acts of Parliament, V., p. 610.

⁴ *Ibid.*, V., p. 615.

² *Ibid.*, V., p. 613.

⁵ Irving's Dumbarton Records, pp. 62-3.

³ *Ibid.*, V., p. 610.

tion, and their petition was remitted to a committee, who reported that the Marquis of Argyle had given them a ship worth £340 sterling, and recommended a payment to them of £100 sterling. The further losses of the petitioners were recommended to be remitted to the Commissioners, for considering and reporting on the losses of the country. This report was approved of by parliament.¹

On 17th November, 1641, Parliament ratified to the burgh of Irvine the charters (1) by King Robert II. of 1372, (2) by Robert III. of 2nd January, 1390-1, (3) by James IV. of 1511, and (4) by James VI. of 1572 and 1601.²

On the same day parliament ratified the charter granted on 5th June, 1635, by King Charles I., as tutor, administrator, and governor to his son, Charles, Prince of Scotland and Wales, Duke of Rothesay, in favour of John Shaw, of Greenock, and Helen Houston, his spouse;³ and likewise all charters, grants, liberties, and privileges granted by the King and his predecessors (1) to Dumbarton, with the office of sheriffship within the burgh and its liberty and territory;⁴ (2) to Renfrew by King James VI. and his predecessors, with the several rights and privileges therein specified;⁵ (3) to Glasgow of its charter of 16th October, 1636, and its rights and privileges;⁶ and (4) to Rutherglen of its rights and privileges.⁷

The merchants of Glasgow appear, apparently about 1642, to have entered into a mutual bond engaging not to repair to the wool market of Ayr; but the convention annulled the bond as prejudicially enhancing the value of wool to themselves.⁸

On 9th February, 1643, the magistrates of Renfrew complained to the privy council against Robert Stuart of Barscub, ten persons named, and others to the number of thirty, who, armed with swords, staves, and forbidden hagbuts and pistols, came to the river Clyde on 19th May, 1642, and to "that salmound

¹ 1645, c. 171. Acts of Parliament, VI., i., p. 379.

⁵ 1641, c. 203. *Ibid.*, V., p. 456.

² 1641, c. 358. *Ibid.*, V., p. 568.

⁶ 1641, c. 225. *Ibid.*, V., p. 473. Glasgow Charters, I., ii., p. 413.

³ 1641, c. 181. *Ibid.*, V., p. 440.

⁷ 1641, c. 291. *Ibid.*, V., p. 518.

⁴ 1641, c. 199. *Ibid.*, V., p. 453.

But against these ratifications the following protestations were made in parliament—(1) by Renfrew against the charter to John Shaw of Greenock (Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, 1641, p. 573. App., p. 719); (2 and 3) by the Marquess of Argyll and the City of Glasgow against the ratification to Dumbarton (*Ibid.*, p. 573. Appendix, p. 719); (4) by Glasgow against the ratification to Renfrew (*Ibid.*, p. 574. Appendix, p. 719); (5) by Renfrew against any ratification granted by that parliament to Glasgow (*Ibid.*); (6) by Dumbarton against the ratification to Glasgow (*Ibid.*); (7) by the Laird of Newark against the ratification granted to Renfrew (*Ibid.*, p. 575); (8) by Glasgow against the ratification to Rutherglen (*Ibid.*, p. 582); (9) by Dumbarton against the ratification to Renfrew (*Ibid.*, p. 583); (10) by Renfrew against the ratification to Dumbarton (*Ibid.*, p. 584); and (11) by the Marquis of Hamilton against Glasgow (*Ibid.*, pp. 583-4). These protestations illustrate the jealousy with which royal burghs and landed proprietors regarded the parliamentary ratification of the grants by the Crown to neighbouring burghs.

⁸ Convention Records, IV., p. 548.

shott forement the lands of Dalmuir, betuix the Marlingford and Blackstone perteaning to the toun of Renfrew, in quhilk salmound shott and fishing within the bounds foresaid, upon both sides of the river of Clyde, the compleaners ar *per expressum* infest, and hes beene in possession past memorie of man.” On that day the complainers had their fishers fishing in the shott with four or five cobles, and not only on that day, but on diverse days thereafter, and in the months of June and July, Stuart and the others threatened the complainers’ fishers and servants, who while fishing in the shott had hacquebutts and pistolets fired at them to the hazard of their lives. Parties having appeared before the privy council, the complaint was held to be proved. Stuart and his son were ordered to be warded in the tolbooth of Edinburgh during the council’s pleasure, and were discharged from troubling the complainers in their fishing save by order of law. Stuart was also remitted to be dealt with by the commissioners of the treasury for carrying pistols.¹

On 7th July, 1642, the convention of burghs convened at Dundee, with reference to an act of the convention held at Edinburgh on 6th August, 1641, ordaining each burgh to send commissioners to define what liberties and privileges the freemen of each burgh had or might have with the freemen of other burghs, or within the liberties of any other burgh, in buying or selling of foreign or “hammell” ware, according to the laws and liberties of the kingdom and privilege of the burghs, had produced, by the commissioners for Edinburgh, a transcript of the charter by King David II. (*antea*, p. 8). Each burgh was required to send its commissioner sufficiently instructed to express its opinion on the question.² In 1644 the convention found that the acts of parliament made in favour of the burghs were defective, not containing a “liquidate penalty,” and appointed the commissioners of several burghs to obtain confirmation, in next parliament, of King David’s charter, “together with ane liquidate penalty against the unfreemen transgressors.”³

On 14th August, 1643, the town council of Glasgow granted a commission to two persons “to aggrie with workmen to take the stains out of the water about the brig, and to take away the stobs out of the water on the south syd.”⁴

On 20th February, 1647, the impoverished condition of Dumbarton is stated as the ground on which an assessment for national purposes was suspended in relation to it.⁵

On 28th January, 1648, Charles I. granted to the burgh of Renfrew a charter of ratification of the burgh, with its lands and the small islands adjoining called Langedrein and Newsands, which of old belonged to the burgh.⁶

¹ Privy Council Register, 2nd Series, VII., p. 390.

⁵ 1647, c. 197. Acts of Parliament, VI., i., p. 702.

² Muniments of Irvine, II., pp. 56-7.

⁶ Great Seal Register, vol. IX., p. 709, No. 1906.

³ Convention Records, IV., p. 549.

⁴ Glasgow Records, II., p. 60.

V.

REIGN OF KING CHARLES II. AND PERIOD OF THE
COMMONWEALTH, 1649-60.

Neither records of the town council nor those of the convention of burghs contain indications that the condition of the Clyde was materially changed during the latter years of the reign of King Charles I., which terminated on 30th January, 1649. His reign was succeeded by that of his son, Charles II., who on 5th February—six days after the execution of his father—was proclaimed by the Scottish Estates King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland.¹ Their action was a direct challenge to the republican party of England, and was resented by the dismissal of the Scottish Commissioners then in England. This was followed, on the 22nd of July, by the invasion of Scotland by Cromwell, under the orders of the English Commonwealth, and the defeat of the Scottish army, under Leslie, at Dunbar, on 3rd September, 1650—a defeat which gave him the immediate possession of Edinburgh and Leith and a permanent footing in Scotland. Under extraordinary conditions the young king—a cynical voluptuary—was crowned on 1st January, 1651. But Cromwell and the English invaders were earnest men, and their overwhelming victory over the Scottish army at Worcester, on 3rd September, placed Scotland under the power of the English parliament, which they sought to incorporate with the commonwealth of England. Commissioners were thereupon appointed to administer the country, and—prostrate as it then was—submission to the will of the conqueror was a necessity. When, therefore, the Scottish deputies appeared before the English commissioners at Dalkeith, forty-four burghs out of fifty-eight and twenty-eight shires accepted the English proposals for submission

¹ The proclamation of the accession of Charles II. only reached the magistrates of Glasgow on 10th February, 1649, and was ordered to be proclaimed on that day at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, “with the gritest solemnitie” at the cross in presence of the whole council—its members and the whole people standing uncovered. All the bells in the town were also ordered to be rung “fra the ending of the proclamation to 12 hours in the day.” This is all that is noticed in the Council Records of the accession of Charles II., and no reference is made to the execution of his father (Glasgow Records, II., p. 158). All the ordinary details of town life seem to have flowed on as if nothing extraordinary had happened or was in progress.

to the commonwealth and to an incorporating union.¹ The terms of the union were, however, not settled before the Barebones Parliament was closed on 12th December, 1653, and Cromwell was declared Protector on the 16th of that month. On 12th April, 1654, the council of state issued an ordinance of union declaring Scotland to be one commonwealth with England, and appointing it to be represented in the Commons by thirty members. Free trade between the two countries was also announced. Previous to that ordinance the commonwealth of England had stood with relation to Scotland as foreigners. Carlisle and Berwick were fiscal barriers, but under it freedom of trade was established in the fullest terms, and without one of the qualifications which, in subsequent projects for communication of trade privileges to the Scots, were so pertinaciously insisted on by the English parliaments. In the parliament which met in 1654 an act was introduced confirming the ordinance, but before it had been passed that parliament was dissolved, and it was not till the second Protectorate parliament, which met in September, 1656, that the ordinance received the sanction of parliament on 28th April, 1657.²

On 17th July, 1649, the convention of burghs authorised Inveraray to be enrolled among the free royal burghs of the kingdom, the commissioner for Dumbarton protesting that this should be without prejudice to the liberty of their burgh, or to any action which it might intend before the lords against it and its liberties.³

About 1652 a burgess of Renfrew, acting probably as collector of the customs of that burgh, attempted to levy custom at the "craft gait" of Paisley from two boats of herring. But he was summarily stopped, and compelled to give security that he would make no further attempt in "a sinistrously way." This was followed about two years afterwards by Renfrew claiming that Paisley should "cease from trading and merchandise." Litigation thereupon ensued, but in 1658 Renfrew appears to have abandoned its claim.⁴

On 21st February, 1653, during the Commonwealth, the Keepers granted a charter (following upon a disposition and procuratory of resignation by James

¹ Three burghs, including Glasgow, lodged formal dissents, and the grounds of this action were stated to be both theological and secular—(1) the vast and boundless toleration of all sorts of error and heresies which the proposed terms of union contemplated, and (2) the vagueness of the scheme for the future government of the country. The continuance, however, of the municipal disfranchisement, which followed the English occupation, and the quartering on the city of nine companies of horse and foot, induced the citizens to reconsider the attitude which their representatives had assumed, and new delegates were appointed to certify the city's acceptance of the commissioners' proposals (Abstract of Charters appended to Glasgow Charters, vol. II., pp. 308-10, and several documents therein referred to. Acts of Parliament, vol. VI., part ii., pp. 772-3. Glasgow Records, II., p. 229).

² Burton's History of Scotland, 2nd ed., VII., pp. 52-54. Hume Brown's History, II., 366-375.

³ Convention Records, III., pp. 345-6.

⁴ Brown's Paisley, I., 287.

earl of Abercorn, dated 22nd July preceding) to Archibald earl of Angus of the lordship and barony of Paisley, comprehending the burgh and village of Paisley, with all the property, rights, and privileges belonging thereto, including a weekly market on Saturday and two annual fairs—one on 25th July, called St. James the Apostle Day, and the other on 26th October, called St. Marnock's Day.¹ By a contract, dated 3rd August, 1653, the earl of Angus granted the lands, lordship, and barony to William lord Cochrane of Dundonald, to whom sasine was given on 7th December following.²

By an ordinance of the lord protector Cromwell, dated 27th June, 1654, the burghs of Lanark, Glasgow, Rutherglen, Rothesay, Renfrew, Ayr, Irvine, and Dumbarton were appointed to be represented in the parliament of England at Westminster by one person, whose election was appointed to take place in Glasgow.³ In the parliament which met on 27th July, 400 members were summoned for England, 30 for Scotland and 30 for Ireland. Of the Scottish members, 20 represented the shires, and the remainder represented the burghs.⁴

On 5th December, 1654, Glasgow directed a letter to be sent to the agent of the burghs showing the great wrong done to Renfrew by the unfreemen within its bounds, who wronged also the whole burghs in the west, and to intimate that if course were not taken with such persons dwelling in clachans as was done within the bounds of Renfrew all the burghs would be greatly prejudiced and wronged.⁵

About this time Dumbarton appears to have expended £52 6s. 4d. in building the "common key of the burgh," and on 30th June, 1655, the overseer of the work produced his accounts to the town council, by whom they were approved.⁶

During the Protectorate Glasgow participated in the benefits which Scotland generally enjoyed under the English administration, and, in his "Northern Memoirs," Franck, writing in 1650, says the commerce of Glasgow was extensive.⁷ But more authoritative information is obtainable six years later. In conformity with their policy, the lord protector and council of state, in August, 1655, despatched to Scotland Mr. Thomas Tucker, "register to the commissioners for the excise" for England, to give his assistance in settling the excise and customs there, and during his residence he acted as a commissioner for these departments of the government. In the performance of these duties he had to report, in 1656, on the condition of the towns in Scotland in which there was

¹ Great Seal Register, X., p. 47, No. 88.

² Metcalfe's Charters of Paisley, p. 98.

³ Acts of Parliament, VI., ii., p. 823. An act of the convention of burghs, on 9th February, 1655, ordained these burghs to contribute, as their proportions of advances made by Glasgow towards the expenses of John Wilkie, their commissioner, the sums following:—Ayr, £183 8s. ; Irvine, £131 ; Dumbarton, £78 12s. ; Renfrew, £52 8s. ; Lanark, £78 12s. ; Rothesay, £39 6s. ; Rutherglen, £26 4s. (Convention Records, III., p. 397).

⁴ Cosmo Innes' Legal Antiquities, p. 139.

⁶ Irving's Dumbartonshire, pp. 529 30.

⁵ Glasgow Records, II., p. 302.

⁷ Quoted in Macgeorge's Old Glasgow, p. 240.

"any trade or commerce, including Glasgow, Renfrew, and Dumbarton," and his report gives an authoritative and interesting account of the condition and trade of these towns at that time. Referring to Glasgow as "a neate burgh town," seated in a "pleasant and fuitfull soyle, and consisting of foure streets, handsomely built in forme of a crosse," he says—

"It is one of the most considerablest burghs of Scotland, as well for the structure as trade of it. The inhabitants (all but the students of the college, which is here) are tradesmen and dealers; some for Ireland with small smiddy coales, in open boats, from four to ten tonnes, from whence they bring hoopoes, ronges, barrel staves, meale, oates, and butter; some from France with pladding, coales and herring (of which there is a greate fishing yearly in the Westerne Sea), for which they returne salt, paper, rosin, and prunes; some to Norway for timber; and every one with theyr neighbours the Highlanders, who come hither from the Isles and Westerne parts; in summer by the Mul of Cantyre, and in winter by the Torban¹ to the head of the Loquh Fyn (which is a small neck of sandy land, over which they usually drawe theyr small boates into the Firth of Dumbarton), and soe passe up in the Cluyde with pladding, dry hides, goate, kid, and deere skyns, which they sell, and purchase with theyr price such comodityes and provisions as they stande in neede of, from time to time. Here hath likewise beeene some who have adventured as farre as the Barbadoes; but the losse they have sustayned by reason of theyr goeing out and comeing home late every yeare have made them discontinue goeing thither any more. The scituation of this towne in a plentiful land, and the mercantile genius of the people, are strong signes of her increase and groweth, were she not chequed and kept under by the shallowness of her river, every day more and more increaseing and filling up, soe that noe vessels of any burden can come neerer up then within fourteene miles, where they must unlade, and send up theyr timber and Norway trade in rafts or floats, and all other comodityes by three or foure tonnes of goods at a tyme, in small cobbles or boates of three, foure, five, and none of above six tons, a boate. There is in this port a collector, a cheeque, and four wayters, who looke to this place, Renfrew, Arskin² on the south, and Kirkepatrick³ on the north side of Cluyde, with Dunbarton, a small and very poore burgh at the head of the firth. The former of these are inhabited with fishermen, that make herring and trade for Ireland with open boates, and the latter gives shelter sometime to a vessel of 16 tons or thereabouts, comeing from England or Ireland with corne."

The member ports of this district are:—

1. Newark, a small place where there are (besides the laird's house of the place) some foure or five houses, but before them a pretty good roade, where all vessels doe ride, unlade, and send theyr goods up the river to Glasgowe in small boates; and at this place there is a wayter constantly attending.

2. Greanoeke, such another, only the inhabitants are more; but all seamen or fishermen trading for Ireland or the Isles in open boates; at which place there is a mole or peere, where vessels in stresse of weather may ride and shelter themselves before they passe up to Newarke, and here likewise is another wayter.

3. Fairly, Culburgh,⁴ Saltcoates, shoars onely of the roade with a few houses, the inhabitants fishermen, who carry fish and cattell for Ireland; bringing home corne and butter for theyr owne use and expence. A wayter in extraordinary here takes care of these places, and advertises the head port when anything comes in thither.

4. Bute, a small island lyeing in the mouth of the Firth, under which some vessels in stormy weather shelter themselves, but passe afterward up the river. The inhabitants are all countrymen and cowheards, who feede cattell, and spinne, and make some woollen clothe,

¹ Tarbert. In Blaeu's Map, Torbaet. ² Erskine Ferry. ³ Kilpatrick. ⁴ Kelburn.

which carryed to bee dyed and dressed at Glasgowe, where they buy still whatever they have occasion of for theyr expense and provision.

And lastly, Irwyn, a small burgh towne, lyeing at the mouth of a river of the same name, which hath some time beeene a pretty small port, but at present clogged and almost choaked up with sand, which the Westerne Sea beats into it, soe as it wrestles for life to maintain a small trade to France, Norway, and Ireland with herring and other goods, brought on horsebacke from Glasgowe, for the purchasing timber, wine, and other comodityes, to supply theyr occasion with. Here also is another wayter in extraordinary. The vessels belonging to this district are, viz. :-

Glasgow 12, viz. :-		150 Tonnes.
	3	150
	1	140
	2	100
	1	50
	3	30
	1	15
	1	12

Renfrew 3 or 4 boates of 5 or 6 tonnes a-piece.

Irwyn 3 or 4, the biggest not exceeding 16 tonnes.

The customs and excise drawn in the head port of Glasgow and its member ports for the four months of June, July, August, and September, 1656, amounted in all to £443 1s. 3d.¹

On 20th July, 1649, a tax roll of the royal burghs, dated 4th July, was produced to the parliament for ratification, showing Glasgow entered at £1170, Irvine £180, Dumbarton £108, Renfrew £72, Rothesay £54, Rutherglen £36. Against this roll Sir James Stewart, lord provost of Edinburgh, and James Borthwick, deacon of the surgeons, protested for the reasons stated.²

On 4th July, 1649, the convention of burghs found that Rothesay had failed to implement an order of the previous convention to produce the rental of its common lands. It was, therefore, fined in £40, and ordered to produce its rental to the next convention under a similar penalty. Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Irvine were at the same time appointed to send their commissioners to Rothesay previous to Michaelmas, to see and report on the form of electing its magistrates.³

On 11th July, 1654, Rutherglen was exempted from sending commissioners to the convention for three years.⁴ On the same day Renfrew was complained against for permitting free traders within its jurisdiction, "and especially those of Kilmalcolm and Greenock,"⁵ and at the convention of 4th July, 1655, its commissioner reported that proceedings had been taken against them.⁶

Whatever may have been the relations between Glasgow and Dumbarton, when the action of either threatened to affect the interests of the other, each burgh

¹ Miscellany of the Scottish Burgh Records
Society, pp. 26, 27, 46.

³ Convention Records, III., p. 334.

² Acts of Parliament, VI., ii., p. 491.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III., p. 382.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 400. On a complaint that certain free burghs and the burgesses therein protected and authorised unfree traders in villages and unfree places to usurp and exercise the liberties of free burgesses, the convention, on 3rd July, 1656, prohibited such abuse under a penalty of £200 (*Ibid.*, p. 417).

seems to have been always ready to apply for the co-operation of the other in matters affecting interests common to both, or to the royal burghs generally. An illustration of this occurred on 25th February, 1657, when a great load of salt was to be brought into Glasgow by the tacksmen of the excise of salt. The introduction of this commodity was regarded by the town council "as very destructive to the whole merchant rank of the burgh and others." One of these tacksmen was Thomas Fleming, who had been made a burgess of Dumbarton, and an official letter was ordered to be sent to that burgh inquiring whether it would recognise that man, whose action was likely to prove "so destructive to both burghs."¹ What the answer to that communication was does not, however, appear. On the 2nd of May, again, a cargo of salt and wine was offered to Dumbarton at a specified price, and on the 6th of July the captain was unlawed for compounding with burgesses of Glasgow before entering his cargo in the port of Dumbarton.²

On 8th August, 1655, Esme duke of Lennox and Richmond was served heir to his father, James duke of Lennox and Richmond, in the office of bailiary and justiciary of the barony and regality of Glasgow, with the heritable title and nomination and yearly election of the magistrates and officers of the burgh.³

During the months of October, November, and December, 1655, it appears that in Glasgow there were collected £114 7s. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. of customs and £266 15s. 1 $\frac{5}{6}$ d. of excise.⁴

In the Dumbarton record of ships which had entered the Clyde from 1595 to 1657, and to which reference has been made,⁵ thirteen ships are given in 1657, with a gross tonnage of 1,966 tons. Of these, ten, with a tonnage of 1,680 tons, were laden with salt; one, of 200 tons, with Norwegian pine trees; and two small vessels with iron, pitch, and deals.⁶

¹ Glasgow Records, II., p. 358.

² Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 538.

³ Glasgow Charters, II., p. 316, No. 654.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 317, No. 658. Acts of Parliament, VI., ii., p. 898. In 1656 Richard Franck, who, in 1650, had been a trooper in the army of Cromwell, describes Glasgow in terms which seem somewhat extravagant. He then "considers the merchants and traders in this eminent Glasgow, whose storehouses and warehouses are stuft with merchandise, as their shops swell big with foreign commodities and returns from France and other remote parts, where they have agents and factors to correspond and enrich their maritime ports, whose charter exceeds all the charters in Scotland; which is a considerable advantage to the city-inhabitants, because, blest with privileges as large, nay, larger than any other corporation. Moreover, they dwell in the face of France, and a free trade. Nor is this all, for the staple of their country consists of linens, friezes, furs, tartans, pelts, hides, tallow, skins, and various other small manufactures and commodities not comprehended in this breviat. Besides . . . they generally exceed in good French wines, as they naturally superabound with fish and fowl; some meat does well with their drink" (Early Travellers in Scotland, p. 192).

A manuscript in the Advocates Library, Edinburgh, states that the ships of Glasgow consisted in 1656 of twelve, with an aggregate tonnage of 1,182 tons (Caledonia, III., pp. 606-7).

⁵ *Antea*, p. 45.

⁶ Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 166.

On 31st October, 1657, Glasgow, considering the great wrong done by several persons in buying boatsful of herring, or herring in great quantities, at the Broomielaw, with a view to being retailed and sold over again there, or elsewhere than in the market, prohibited such purchase and sale, under a penalty of £20 Scots for each fault.¹

On 24th October, 1657, the burgh of Renfrew applied to the convention for authority, with the advice and consent of Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Rutherglen, to sell as much of its common lands as would enable it to buy and annex its common mill to the common good. The authority thus sought was granted subject to the condition that no more would be sold than was necessary for the purpose, and that the price should be applied exclusively to that object.²

On 27th February, 1658, Glasgow had under consideration the plea depending between it and Dumbarton, in which caution of lawburrows was found on either side, "and understanding the thing debaitable does also righteously perteine to the toune as to Dumbartane," by virtue of the old indentures and other writs set down thereanent, after long advice and consultation ordained all burgesses to enter their ships and other vessels imported by them in the town-clerk's chamber, as was formerly done in Dumbarton. No one, moreover, was to be entered in Dumbarton till the questions at issue were decided by the court, under a penalty of 100 merks Scots. This somewhat bold move to bring matters to a final issue involved some risk to the burgesses who gave effect to it, and the council agreed to relieve them of all cost or damage which compliance might involve.³

Relieved by the decision of the Lords Auditors in 1493 from the claim of Renfrew to levy custom in Paisley, that burgh remained subject to its baronial superiors, the abbot and monks, and after the Reformation to the commendators and lords, till 3rd May, 1658, when William Lord Cochrane, lord of the erection of Paisley, and William, master of Cochrane, his son, entered into a contract with Paisley, by which they renounced and overgave all right of superiority of the burgh, to the effect that it, with its freedom, liberties and privileges, should in future be held of the Lord Protector and his successors, and that all right of property and magistracy of the burgh should be vested in the magistrates and community.⁴ On 8th December, 1665, King Charles II. granted to Paisley a charter of resignation and confirmation of the burgh, to be held of the Prince and Steward of Scotland, for payment of £7 Scots of yearly feu-duty.⁵

On 6th May, 1658, Glasgow obtained a decree of the privy council against Dumbarton for coming in a hostile way, armed, to Newark, and entering vessels belonging to it, and committing many riots. For this action Dumbarton was fined

¹ Glasgow Records, II., p. 383.

⁴ Metcalfe's Charters of Paisley, pp. 98-107.

² Convention Records, III., pp. 453-4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

³ Glasgow Records, pp. 391-2.

£500 sterling.¹ It was probably in connection with this hostile act that Glasgow, on 1st April, 1658, sent two persons to Edinburgh to raise letters against Dumbarton for the riot;² and it seems to have been likewise in the same connection that the privy council ordered the magistrates of both towns to choose a third person to uplift the dues of the ships which arrived in the river,³ and that on 16th April a commissioner from the city went to Dumbarton to join in appointing this third person, and to require restitution of the sails, ammunition, measures, arms, goods, and gear which had been taken out of the ships belonging to Glasgow, as also to obtain release from prison of a burgess of the city—all in accordance with the orders of the privy council.⁴

On 7th April Dumbarton sent a commissioner to Edinburgh to a convention “called for staying of a grant making the toun of Paisley a royal burgh.”⁵

At the convention held on 12th July Dumbarton complained against Glasgow for cellaring its salt in unfree places, to its prejudice, and a remit was made to the commissioners of several burghs to “compos the bussines.”⁶

On 3rd September, 1658—the anniversary of the battles of Dunbar and Worcester—a day which he had kept as one of thanksgiving—Cromwell died. But even then the great work which he had accomplished was being recognised by those whose opposition he had at first to encounter, but who were beginning to ally themselves with his government. Thus no opposition was offered to the succession of his son Richard, who was at once proclaimed Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the territories belonging to them. But he proved wholly unfit to sustain the burden which his father had borne. When, therefore, the forces of anarchy broke loose, he retired into private life in the following year.

On 17th October, 1658, the provost and a bailie of Dumbarton were sent to the marquis of Argyll at Inveraray “to purchas ane letter of recommendation to the commissioners for the administration of justice anent the action depending betwix this burgh and Glasgow,” craving that the action should be called and a quick despatch given to it;⁷ and on the 9th of the following month of November a commissioner was sent to Edinburgh with three charters in favour of the burgh, granted by “King Alexander.”⁸ On 27th December a bailie and the dean of guild, who had returned from Edinburgh, produced a voluminous “Information” as to the dispute between the two burghs. An account of the law expenses and personal charges of the commissioners, given in on 5th February following, amounted to £402 8s.⁹

¹ Glasgow Charters, vol. ii., p. 322, No. 674.

² Glasgow Records, II., p. 395.

³ *Ibid.*, II., p. 396.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II., p. 396.

⁵ Irving's Dumbarton Records, p. 538.

⁶ Convention Records, III., p. 472.

⁷ Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 538. Mac-Leod's Ancient Records of Dumbarton, p. 74.

⁸ Irving's Dumbarton Records, p. 538.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 539.

Wearied, no doubt, with these frequent misunderstandings and law pleas as to the use of the river Clyde, and realising how seriously it affected the development of the city, Glasgow was becoming more and more impressed with the necessity for an arrangement which would give it independent rights. But its magistrates and councillors doubtless had uneasy recollections of the old agreements entered upon with Dumbarton, ere it dreamed of taking the position which was even now opening up to it. Were these old agreements and the practice which followed upon them to be like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable? Obviously not, if the city was not to remain for ever a third or fourth rate burgh. Accordingly, on 1st January, 1659, the provost and five others were commissioned "to think upon and advise on the best overtures for settling of the mater betwixt this burgh and Dumbartane, and to meit with thair commissioners" for this purpose.¹ But, as will be seen, the litigations then depending were allowed to run their course.

¹ Glasgow Records, II., p. 410.

VI.

REIGN OF KING CHARLES II. SUBSEQUENT TO THE RESTORATION, 1660-85.

After a period of anarchy and reaction negotiations were opened by certain monarchists with Charles for his restoration, and these were followed by a secret message from General Monk recommending to him a course of action, which Charles adopted, issuing from Breda a conciliatory declaration to the nation, which was submitted to parliament, and on 1st May, 1660, it resolved to return him its humble thanks and professions of loyalty and duty. On 8th May Charles was proclaimed in London King of England, France, Scotland, and Ireland, and on the 23rd he embarked for England, landing at Dover on the 25th. On the 29th he entered London, where the lords and commons were assembled in Whytehall to receive and welcome him in the hall through which his father had passed to the block. Happily, however, the Puritan Revolution, though thus closed, had arrested the growth of absolute monarchy in the kingdom.

At this time the population of Glasgow is said to have been 14,678—nearly double of what it was fifty years previously.

It would appear that during the Protectorate, and also during the occupation of Dumbarton Castle by persons hostile to the government, restrictions were imposed upon the free passage of boats up the river. After the restoration of King Charles II. no time appears to have been lost in applying to the new government to have these restrictions removed. An order to this effect was obtained by Bailie Campbell of Glasgow, and brought home by him, and on 4th June, 1660, the town council recommended James Hamilton to ride to Dumbarton and show the order to the captain of the castle.¹

But neither the king nor his advisers were prepared to adopt the policy of Cromwell in the commercial relations of the two countries. England and Scotland, says Professor Innes, were at once thrown back into the position of foreigners to each other, and antagonists in trade. Immediately after the Restoration an authoritative table of customs was issued for Scotland (subscribed by Charles and by Lauderdale as secretary). The inconvenience of this exclusive system of

¹ Glasgow Records, II., p. 446.

customs, which tended to keep the two nations jealously separate, was recognised by the government, and in 1657-8 a commission was appointed to treat of mutual freedom of trade, but the Scottish burghs resented their exclusion of trade with the English colonies, and did not favour the English proposal.¹

On 12th July, 1660, the Convention found that Renfrew and Inveraray had made residents in Greenock burgesses of their respective burghs, and that they daily exercised trade. These burghs were accordingly ordered to require all their burgesses to make residence in their respective burghs, or, failing their doing so, to deprive them of their freedom.²

On the 8th of September the commissioners of Dumbarton to the convention of estates reported that they had craved to have their burgh "reponed in the right of collecting the dues in the Clyde taken from them by the late usurped authorities of the English council of state," but they got no satisfactory answer.³ On 29th January, 1661, parliament, on the petition of Dumbarton, and on the report of the commissioners for bills and trade, ordained a contribution to be collected at all the parish churches in burghs and landward, south of the Forth, for the repair of the embankment to protect the town, injured by the overflow of the Leven.⁴

On 20th May, 1661, parliament ratified the liberties and rights of Dumbarton, and specially the charter by James VI., dated 13th December, 1609, with the ratification thereof by parliament on 17th November, 1641. Against this ratification the provosts of Glasgow and Renfrew protested.⁵

On the same day parliament also ratified the charter by Charles I. to Glasgow, dated 16th October, 1636, with the ratification thereof by parliament on 17th November, 1641, and several other charters and writings. Against this ratification the provosts of Dumbarton and Renfrew and the dukes of Lennox and Hamilton protested.⁶

On 30th May, 1661, Rutherglen presented a petition to parliament setting forth its low condition by reason of its contiguity to Glasgow, which had all the commerce and trade in those parts, and that it had only two annual fairs—viz., Trinity Tuesday and Lukesmas. It therefore craved two additional yearly fairs—one on 28th April and the other on 20th August—each to continue for four days; and parliament recommended the lords of exchequer to pass a new signature in favour of the burgh to that effect.⁷

On 1st June, 1661, the water bailie of the Clyde was directed to observe all

¹ Preface to Halyburton's *Ledger*, pp. cvii., cviii.

⁶ 1661, c. 235. *Acts of Parliament*, VII., pp. 220, 223. *Glasgow Charters*, II., pp. 36-42, No. 131.

² Convention Records, III., p. 510.

⁷ 1661, c. 259. *Acts of Parliament*, VII., p. 239.

³ Irving's *Dumbarton Records*, p. 79.

⁴ 1661, c. 32. *Acts of Parliament*, VII., p. 23.

⁵ 1661, c. 234. *Acts of Parliament*, VII., p. 219.

persons who either loaded or unloaded boats containing victual or other goods at Govan, or between it and Renfrew, and to require them to find caution to appear before the magistrates of Glasgow and himself, with a view to their being fined and punished for their wrongdoing.¹

Scotland appears to have been visited by Jorevin de Rochedford shortly after the Restoration, about 1661. Speaking of Glasgow, he says it is the second town in the kingdom of Scotland, situated upon a hill that extends gently to the brink of the river Clyde, which is capable of bearing vessels, since the tide rises here a little from the gulf of Dunbritton, into which it empties itself, so that vessels can come from Ireland to Glasgow. The streets of Glasgow are large and handsome, as if belonging to a new town; but the houses are only of wood, ornamented with carving. Here live several rich shopkeepers.² Shortly afterwards, apparently about 1662, John Ray, the naturalist, visited Scotland, and went to Glasgow, which he describes as the second city in Scotland, fair, large, and well built, cross-wise, somewhat like unto Oxford, the streets very broad and pleasant.³

On 27th May, 1662, an act of parliament enacted that the ancient government of the church by archbishops and bishops should be restored and re-established.⁴

The rapid increase in the shipping of Glasgow (to the extent of nearly three and a-half times that in 1597) indicates a considerable development of commercial enterprise, notwithstanding the unfavourable conditions, and seems to have suggested the necessity for the erection of a quay at which the boats which carried goods to and from the city might load and unload. Accordingly, on 9th August, 1662, the town council determined "for many good reasons and considerations, and for the more commodious loading and unloading of boats," that there should be a little quay built at the Broomeielaw as early as possible.⁵ The quay thus resolved upon was in process of erection on 23rd May, 1663,⁶ when the town council appointed five persons to take charge of the building, and authorised £20 sterling to be paid to John Clark, mason, in part payment of his work thereon;⁷ on 6th June the masters of families were required to send out their servants to carry sand for filling up the back of the new quay; and seven days later, viz., on 13th June, the council ordered the quay to be raised "two stones" higher than was originally proposed, and appointed the dean of guild to endeavour to get additional oak timber, either in the "hie kirk or bak galerie," for facing the work.⁸

On 12th June, 1661, an act was passed for the encouragement of shipping and navigation, requiring, under specified penalties, all goods of foreign product or

¹ Glasgow Records, II., p. 464.

⁵ Glasgow Records, II., p. 491.

² Early Travellers in Scotland, p. 219.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III., p. 13.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

⁷ *Ibid.*, III., p. 14.

⁴ 1662, c. 3. Acts of Parliament, p. 372.

⁸ *Ibid.*, II., p. 15.

Glasgow Charters, II., p. 46, No. 133.

manufacture, brought into Scotland, to be taken only from the places in which they were produced, and in ships belonging to Scotland or built in the kingdoms in which the goods grew or were produced.¹ On 8th July, 1663, the merchant venturers of Glasgow petitioned parliament setting forth the provisions of that act, and stating that on the faith thereof they had expended the most part of their fortunes in building ships and advancing trade, but that several strangers and others, and specially Dutchmen, had imported several commodities in Dutch vessels on the Clyde and other parts, and had broken bulk and sold and used these commodities. It also set forth that when the petitioners were about to put the provisions of the act in force they were opposed by the purchasers of the goods who concurred with the Dutchmen; that in consequence of this the petitioners were likely to be ruined, there being ten or twelve vessels already built or in process of being built. The petition, with the report of the Lords of the Articles, and those appointed by them to consider it, having been submitted to parliament, it ratified and approved the act of 1661, and ordained the king's admiral and other officials to put it in execution.²

On 4th April, 1663, the provost of Glasgow reported that the provost of Dumbarton had expressed his desire to bring about an arrangement between the two burghs as to their respective rights in the Clyde, which would remove all differences between them, and that any matters which might not be so settled might be determined by the chancellor. The council therefore remitted to the provost to meet the provost of Dumbarton and endeavour to carry out such an arrangement.³ At this time a long-standing plea between the two burghs was in dependence. It had been instituted during the Protectorate, and was subsequently revived, and, if not amicably arranged, would have to be proceeded with. No arrangement, however, appears to have been arrived at, and the provost of Glasgow was on 1st January, 1664, authorised to proceed to Edinburgh, and use his utmost efforts to bring the long-pending questions to a close, either by agreement with the parties interested, or by prosecuting the same in law to the uttermost.⁴ On 16th February the provost, on his return from Edinburgh, was able to report that the whole business—probably the negotiations for compromise—was brought to an end. For his services he received thanks.⁵ On 28th May, 1664, the provost of Dumbarton was appointed to proceed to Edinburgh on 8th June regarding the “Clyde privileges”;⁶ and on 22nd October the provost of Glasgow was asked to go to Edinburgh and “waken Dumbartane busines.”⁷ On 17th December instructions were given to the dean of guild and deacon-convener “to try what fit witnesses they can get within the town for proving

¹ 1661, c. 277. *Acts of Parliament*, VII., p. 257.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III., p. 25.

² 1663, c. 8. *Ibid.*, VII., p. 454. Glasgow Records, III., p. 18.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III., p. 26.

³ Glasgow Records, III., p. 10.

⁶ Irving's Dumbarton Records, p. 83.

⁷ Glasgow Records, III., p. 44.

against Dumbarton ;¹ and on 31st December the provost was requested to return to Edinburgh in regard to it.² On 25th March, 1665, he reported the expenses of counsel and witnesses and deputations in connection with the Dumbarton and other business to be £1,136 12s. Scots [£94 14s. 4d. sterling].³ On 30th December the sum of £50 Scots was paid to him on his proceeding to Edinburgh to put a "close to the debait" between the two burghs.⁴ On 12th February, 1666, he reported that a decree had been pronounced against Dumbarton, and requested money to be sent to meet expenses ;⁵ and on 19th April, he produced to the council a decree of absolvitor pronounced by the court of session in the long-pending action.⁶ The nature and history of the action may be shortly stated. During the Protectorate two actions were raised before the supreme court in Edinburgh—one by Glasgow *v.* Dumbarton, the other by Dumbarton *v.* Glasgow. These were wakened after the Restoration, and both were decided in favour of Glasgow on 8th February, 1666. In the former action Glasgow pleaded that Dumbarton had no right to exact or uplift from Glasgow, nor any of the vessels and ships belonging to it, or freighted by it, arriving in the Clyde, at the roads and ports of Potterig, Inchgreen, and Newark, anchorage, weyage, &c., or other dues whatsoever ; but that it was lawful for Glasgow to arrive with its ships and goods within the river, and specially at the before-named roads or ports, and to load there and transport its goods upon the Clyde to Glasgow, free of the burden of the pretended duties to Dumbarton of anchorage, &c. It was, therefore, craved that Dumbarton should be ordained to cease from further troubling Glasgow on arriving with its ships and goods upon the Clyde, and loading and unloading its ships and goods at these roads. In the action at the instance of Dumbarton against Glasgow the former set forth the various charters granted to it, and specially the charter by King James VI., under which last it claimed the privileges and levied the dues which it asked the court to sanction by declarator. In the former action the court decreed in favour of Glasgow, finding that it had no right to exact from Glasgow, nor from any vessels or ships belonging to or freighted by its inhabitants, burgesses, and community, arriving in the Clyde at the roads and ports of Poterig, Inchgreen, and Newark, any dues whatsoever, and ordering Dumbarton to cease from troubling or molesting Glasgow in the exercise of the right thus declared. The judges, however, who pronounced this decision (with the exception of the president) appear to have concurred in recommending the commissioners of each burgh to confer together and bind themselves to some agreement exempting the burgh of Glasgow from payment of any of the dues claimed by Dumbarton out of Glasgow vessels or vessels freighted by them, and

¹ Glasgow Records, III., p. 47.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III., pp. 72-78. Irving's Dumbarton

² *Ibid.*, III., p. 49.

Records, pp. 584-5.

³ *Ibid.*, III., pp. 51, 52.

Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 60 112. No.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III., p. 66.

136; pp. 112-120, No. 137.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III., p. 67

Glasgow was recommended to pay Dumbarton such sum of money as it thought fitting. In the latter action Glasgow was assailed from its conclusions. Dumbarton appears to have agreed to make an arrangement with Glasgow such as was suggested by the lords.¹ But a fresh quarrel between the two towns is referred to in a minute of the council of Glasgow on 18th August, 1666. Notwithstanding this decree, Dumbarton seems to have continued to levy dues which were resisted by Glasgow, and a riot ensued. A complaint to the privy council was thereupon made, and on 1st September the provost was appointed to attend the privy council and follow out the complaint.²

The magistrates of Rothesay having complained to the convention on 26th May, 1664, of a riot committed by the Sheriff of Bute in relieving their prisoners without their order, and beating their magistrates and others, the convention therefore recommended the magistrates of Edinburgh, with the agent for the burghs, to concur with Rothesay in applying for redress to the privy council in so far as the complaint was fair, true, and just.³

On 30th June, 1665, all the inhabitants of the burgh of Rothesay were required to contribute towards the repair of its harbour.⁴

Between 1666 and 1670 King James's old project for a National Union was ineffectively revived by the government of Charles II., which appointed two commissioners to endeavour to adjust an incorporating union between England and Scotland. But the Scots were in no mood for the favourable consideration of such overtures. They resented bitterly, says Burton, the ruin of their commerce by the English Navigation Act. "They represented that they had enjoyed a free trade here in England, and in all the dominions and plantations belonging of the kingdom of England, more than fifty-and-six years, without any considerable obstructions all that time."⁵ Now, however, they are treated as aliens and enemies.⁵

From the descendants of Lord Claud Hamilton, the Abbey of Paisley, comprehending the lordship of erection of the burgh, passed to Lord Cochrane of Paisley and Dundonald, who with his eldest son entered into a contract with the magistrates and council of the town on 3rd May, 1658, by which they renounced all right of superiority over the burgh, in order to its being held by the Lord Protector

¹ Irving's Dumbarton Records, pp. 84, 85. ² Convention Records, III., p. 570.

² Glasgow Records, III., p. 83. ⁴ Hewitson's Isle of Bute, II., p. 200.

⁵ Burton's History (2nd edition), VII., p. 185. The discontent of the people of Scotland at this time is further explained by the abolition of free trade with England, which had closed the market for Scottish corn and cattle. Far more deadly to Scotland, however, was Charles's war with Holland, which, beginning in 1664, lasted with little intermission for the following ten years. For centuries Holland had been the main outlet for Scottish exports, and the closing of the Dutch ports was a calamity of national magnitude. Besides, the annual grant of £40,000 to the crown, which would have been a heavy drain on the revenues of the country at the most flourishing period of its history, made the burden intolerable under the circumstances at this time (Hume Brown's History of Scotland, II., p. 394).

and his successors as superiors; they also renounced all right of property and magistracy of the burgh, and election of its magistrates and officers, and of its lands, tenements, and others, to the effect that the magistrates, council, and community might enjoy the same, and be free to elect their own magistrates, council, and officers as they might find convenient. So matters remained till 8th December, 1665, when King Charles II. granted a charter of confirmation in favour of the magistrates, councillors, and community of the various lands therein specified, with power to elect, remove, and change its magistrates and office-bearers, to hold a weekly market,¹ two annual fairs, to buy and sell goods brought into the burgh, and to have tradesmen and workmen. It also confirmed the contract between Lord William Cochrane and his son and the town, above referred to. In 1692 Lord Cochrane obtained from the Crown a charter of the lordship of erection, and in 1736 the magistrates and council acquired all the other rights remaining in the family of Dundonald.² Upon these titles, say the Municipal Commissioners, the rights and privileges of Paisley continued to rest till 1833.

After the restoration the government of Charles II. treated Scottish trade as alien, and, under the Navigation Act, placed it on almost the same footing as the Dutch, subjecting it and the products of Scottish industry to prohibitory duties. Nevertheless, in 1667, the shipping trade of Glasgow had grown to such an extent as to make it desirable to have a register of the ships, and on 5th October of that year the town council ordered a book to be kept in the town clerk's chambers, in which each ship that came into the river should be entered, the entry to be paid for by the owner.³

About this time an active spirit of trading enterprise was developed in Glasgow, and required the establishment of a harbour, to which its shipping might be brought. But the shallowness of the Clyde in its upper reaches rendered it necessary for the city to look for the requisite accommodation in or below Dumbarton. Such vessels as carried goods to Glasgow loaded and unloaded many miles below the city, and the cargo for the intermediate distance was transferred to small boats. It was, therefore, proposed to acquire land from Dumbarton on which to construct harbour

¹ This charter altered the market day from Monday to Friday, but on 30th January, 1697, the magistrates altered the day to Thursday, and it so remains.

² Municipal Corporation Reports, vol. II., p. 283. *Antea*, p. 98.

³ Glasgow Records, III., p. 97. In 1667 a company was formed to prosecute whale fishing and the manufacture of soap, and five ships were fitted out for the fishing, but that department was abandoned with considerable loss to the partners. The soap manufactory was continued till 1777, when it too was given up. In 1669 sugar refining, and about the same time the tanning of leather, rope spinning, and the manufacture of plaids, coarse cloths, and linens were introduced. Previous to 1707 the foreign trade of the city was small, being almost wholly confined to transactions with the Continent, and mainly with Holland. In 1707 Walter Gilmour & Co. cured and packed 300 lasts of herrings, which they exported to St. Martins in France bringing back brandy in return (Cleland's Abridgement, pp. 340-2).

works. The proposal was, however, declined by that burgh on the ground, it is said, that the great influx of mariners and others would raise the price of provisions to its inhabitants. It appears to have also opened negotiations with Dame Margaret Crauford, Lady Kilbirny, for a purchase of part of the lands of Easter Greenock and Cartsburn, on the opposite shore, on which to construct a harbour, but Sir John Shaw succeeded in effecting the purchase so as to protect the town and harbour of Greenock. So baulked, Glasgow had to look elsewhere, and in January and February, 1668, it acquired from Sir Patrick Maxwell of Newark, with consent of his wife and son, at the price of 1,300 merks [£722 4s. 5d. sterling], besides a feu-duty of four merks yearly, lands in the parish of Kilmalcolm¹ and sheriffdom of Renfrew, described as "ane merk land of old extent;" with the harbour and station or shipping port for anchoring ships, barks, and other vessels, and a right to build a harbour into the river and other privileges.² The feu-duty to be paid was four merks [4s. 5*½*d.]. Of this deed the city obtained a Crown charter of confirmation by King Charles II., under the great seal, on 20th January, 1668,³ and by it the land so acquired, as far as within the sea mark, was incorporated into the "port and harbour of Glasgow." The city was, moreover, empowered to construct there a port and harbour; to build bulwarks and a tolbooth or prison; to create bailies, clerks, and other officers; to exercise exclusive baronial jurisdiction, civil and criminal; and to exact small and petty customs and anchorage, and all other duties belonging to a free port and harbour. On the 27th of January Glasgow resolved to construct, on the town's public charges and for its benefit, a pier or harbour, with houses, dykes, and such further buildings as might be found to be necessary.⁴ The town of Newport (or as afterwards known by the name of Port-Glasgow) was erected, a harbour was constructed, and what is said to have been the first graving dock in Scotland was formed under the direction of James Watt.

On 23rd December, 1669, an act of parliament ratified the conveyance of the lands of Newark, and also the city's right to the lands of Barlanark or Provan; the decree of declarator by the lords of council and session, pronounced on 8th February, 1666; the charter by King Charles I., dated 16th October, 1636; the acts of parliament dated 17th November, 1641, and 20th May, 1661; and all other charters and rights granted to the city.⁵

¹ In 1696 the town of Port-Glasgow and bay of Newark were disjoined from Kilmalcolm and erected into a separate parish (Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 264-6).

² Glasgow Records, II.I., p. 101. Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 132-41, No. 139. Brown's History of Glasgow, II., p. 33.

³ Glasgow Charters, vol. II., pp. 142-55, No. 140,

⁴ Glasgow Records, III., pp. 101, 103, *et seq.* (see Index).

⁵ Glasgow Charters, pp. 168-91, No. 142. In 1669, James Brome, a clergyman of the Church of England, visited Scotland, and published an account of his visit in 1700. "At last," he says, "we came to the renowned city of Glasgow; 'tis situated upon the river Glotta,

Easter Greenock belonged to Sir John Crawford, baronet, of Kilbirnie and Easter Greenock, who, on 13th June, 1642, obtained from King Charles I., as administrator for his son, Prince Charles, a charter of confirmation of the lands of Kilbirnie and the lands of Easter Greenock, all formerly forming part of the lands of Kilbirnie. Further, the King united part of the barony into a free burgh of barony, with power to Sir John to choose bailies, to build a tolbooth, with a market cross, and to hold a weekly market and two annual fairs, to erect a harbour and bulwark upon the lands, to levy petty customs, &c. He also granted a right of fishing for salmon, herring and other fishes within the lands, and where the Clyde ebbs and flows, &c.¹ On his death these estates passed to his daughter, Margaret, who in 1664 married Patrick Lindsay, second son of John Earl of Crawford. Finding Easter Greenock burdened with debt, she and her husband, in 1668, sold the portion of it surrounding Crawfords-dyke privately, to her kinsman, Thomas Crawford, merchant and burgess of Glasgow, and the remainder to Sir John Shaw, knight, of Wester Greenock.²

On 11th July, 1670, King Charles II., as Prince and Steward of Scotland, granted and confirmed to John Shaw in ferment, and to Sir John Shaw, his eldest lawful son, in fee, the lands and barony of Greenock, including the lands of Wester Greenock Shaw and the burgh of barony of Greenock, with all and sundry markets, fairs, tolls, customs, &c., belonging thereto. Moreover, he created and incorporated the town and burgh of Greenock into a free burgh of barony, with power to admit free burgesses. He also conferred on them full power and liberty to buy and sell wine and all other kinds of merchandise

or Cluyd, over which is placed a very fair bridge, supported with eight arches, and for pleasantness of sight, sweetness of air, and delightfulness of its gardens and orchards, enriched with most delicious fruits, surpasseth all other places in this tract; the buildings in this town are very large and beautiful" (Early Travellers in Scotland, p. 248).

¹ Great Seal Register, IX., pp. 423-4, No. 1130

² To put beyond question the right of Margaret Lindsay (Lady Kilbirnie) and her husband to sell Easter Greenock, which was under entail, they brought an action of declarator in the Court of Session against the heirs of entail, and called Sir John for his interest. The heirs did not appear, but Sir John, for his own security, stated every proponable objection to the sale. The Court, however, on 20th January and 3rd February, 1669, held the sale to be valid (Morrison's Dictionary of Decisions, XVIII., No. 15347. Williamson's Old Cartsburn, pp. 9 13, 17-25).

From the sale to Sir John Shaw of the lands of Easter Greenock a reservation was made of the portion afterwards known as Carsburn, including the harbour, where all the shipping which had hitherto frequented the bay of Greenock lay, and, as above mentioned, the excepted property was conveyed by Lady Kilbirnie and her husband to her kinsman, Thomas Crawford. The conveyance was confirmed by a charter under the great seal dated 16th July, 1669. It describes the lands as the forty shilling land of old extent of Carsburn, with the manor place, houses, &c., and also that part of the lands called Crawfuirdsdyke, alias Cartsdyke, &c., with the right, privilege, and liberty of the free burgh of barony of Crawfuirdsdyke, and all jurisdiction pertaining thereto (Williamson's Old Cartsburn, p. 25).

and staple goods, and to pack and peel, with full power to admit and receive within the burgh, bakers, brewers, fleschers, fishmongers, tailors, shoemakers, smiths, wrights, glovers, saddlers, cutlers, websters, and all other tradesmen and mechanics necessary, as freely as any other tradesmen within the kingdom; and also to appoint bailies, clerks, servants, and other officers to govern the burgh, to build a tolbooth and market cross and keep a tron, to hold a weekly market and two free fairs annually, and to exercise all the liberties, privileges, and jurisdictions competent to any free barony or burgh of barony. Power was also given to repair and build free ports, harbours, and havens, with all the privileges and liberties of free ports enjoyed by any other port or harbour in the kingdom.¹

Under an act passed on 12th June, 1661,² entitled “an act for the fishings, and erecting of companies for promoting the same,” a company, with premises at Greenock, was formed, the King being a partner, and the company taking the name of the Royal Fishery Society. In 1671 the society leased from John and Sir John Shaw, lairds of Greenock, a piece of ground there measuring 42 ells in length and 27 ells in breadth, with free access from the harbour and shore, and power to build houses and storehouses on the ground; and in 1673 it leased from them “that piece of ground upon the shoare and eist syde of that pairt of Greenock commonly called the Rue, extending in measure to 170 foots square, . . . with libertie to enclose or build houses upon the said ground for making of herring or other fishes, accommodating their servants, and keeping of their cask, salt, and other materials.” The tacks were for many successive periods of nineteen years, the rent under the first tack being 50 merks, with £100 additional at the beginning of each period of nineteen years; and under the second tack the double of these sums.³ The society was dissolved in 1690, when parliament restored to the lieges their rights of fishing, but reserved to the royal burghs the right of export.⁴ Glasgow had acquired from the society their store, storehouses, and stock in 1683 or 1684.⁵ A local historian thus refers to the society and the fishing trade:—“Holding a charter giving the company exclusive power to cure herrings before 30th September, it flourished for many years; but when the charter was withdrawn, as a restraint on trade, the company was dis-

¹ Though the 1670 charter empowered the magistrates and council “to admit merchants and all kinds of tradesmen and others to be free burgesses within the burgh, no more being exacted for admission than 30 merks Scots,” the Municipal Commissioners report that there is no instance on record of any burgesses ever having been admitted (Municipal Corporation Reports, I., p. 88).

The charter of 1670 was ratified to Sir John by act of parliament on 6th September, 1681 (1681, c. 76. Acts of Parliament, VIII., pp. 344-347)

² 1661, c. 279. Acts of Parliament, VII., p. 259.

³ Glasgow Charters, II., p. 358, No. 783; p. 365, No. 807.

⁴ 1690, c. 103. Acts of Parliament, IX., p. 224.

⁵ Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 381-2, 384, 406.

solved, and the Royal Closs and its cellars were acquired by Glasgow, and long used as tobacco warehouses. At that time the Clyde and its lochs were a great resort of the herring, no fewer than 300 boats being employed in the season in that fishery. Greenock in those days had for its motto the very appropriate one, "Let herrings swim that trade maintain." The herring trade was then the staple one, and many families rose to position and opulence by it. It is worthy of observation that the herrings which were caught in the Clyde were larger, firmer, and of a better taste, and took better with the salt, than any caught elsewhere, and Clyde herrings were then prized both at home and abroad, very much as Lochfyne herrings are in our own day. Besides herring, we find from an old list that there were not fewer than fifty-seven different kinds of fish then caught in the Clyde at Greenock, including pellocks or porpoises, salmon, sea-trout, cod, haddock, whitings, gudgeons, sturgeons, and others of the piscatorial genus. The seal, too, was a frequent visitor, and could be found in almost any season along the shore between Greenock and Gourock and the sand-banks in the neighbourhood. . . . The harbour was chiefly used by the herring boats, but occasionally vessels brought in cargoes of grain and sometimes timber from the Baltic ports in return for the herrings. For the grain cargoes discharged at Greenock it was found needful to have stores—cellars they were called in those days—and Sir John seems to have granted feus at a moderate rate to encourage their erection."¹

On 26th May, 1665, the town council of Irvine, in consideration of the great prejudice which the burgh had sustained through the decay of the harbour and the water of Irving changing its channel, so that neither ships nor barks could repair to the burgh, and also considering that, under a contract between the burgh and the lairds of Dundonald and Sewalton, the burgh was authorised to cut through the lands of Marreis, at the place called the Docke, "for making of ane harberie at ane neir cutt," resolved to cut through the lands at that place, so as to change the channel of the water. The inhabitants were therefore ordered to go out by quarters daily for making the cutting—those who absented themselves after being warned to be fined 12s. Scots for each day's absence.² Eight years afterwards the burgh having, in a supplication to the convention, represented its decay "through want of trade occasioned by the restraint of Irish commodities, which were the only means and commerce whereby the burgh subsisted," the convention, on 3rd July, 1673, ordained Glasgow, Stirling, and Dumbarton to take cognisance of the state of the burgh, and to report.³

Amongst the earliest privileges conferred on the burgesses of royal burghs, as has been seen, was a monopoly of commerce and manufacture within their respec-

¹ Campbell's Sketches of Greenock, I., pp. 15-17.

² Muniments of Irvine, II., p. 170. On 5th July, 1671, the convention recommended the whole burghs to give a voluntary contribution to Irvine for the repair of its bridge (Convention Records, III., p. 626).

³ Convention Records, III., p. 634.

tive limits. In most burghs these priviléges came to be differentiated between the merchants and craftsmen, but after a time the merchant class assumed the government of the burghs. This monopoly by the merchant burgesses was resented by the craftsmen burgesses; eventually the latter had, through a representation of their corporations, a limited share in the administration of the several burghs. The intramural discords consequent on this state of matters do not seem to have interfered with the assertion by each burghal community of its exclusive privileges as between other burghs of the same class, or between burghs of regality and barony, or between persons who, though not members of these subordinate corporations, exercised privileges reserved to royal burghs, frequently under coverture of burgesses of royal burghs. The frequent disputes which agitated the Clyde burghs, and occupied much of the attention of the Convention of Royal Burghs, as these have been alluded to, illustrate this condition of chronic suspicion. After a time the disastrous effect of the exclusive mercantile and manufacturing systems, and the inefficiency of the means employed to maintain them, became apparent, and on 10th July, 1672, an Act of Parliament "concerning the Privileges of Burghs Royal,"¹ was passed. It proceeded on a narrative of the necessity for encouraging the export of the growth and manufacture of the kingdom, and the import of foreign commodities required for the use and satisfaction of the people, and for removing the numerous controversies which had arisen, to the great disquiet of the royal burghs and other incorporations and people of the kingdom, occasioned specially by the Act 1633, c. 24,² which prohibited the exportation of any merchandise save by burgesses of royal burghs, their factors or servants; forbade all persons dwelling out of burghs from using merchandise or buying wine, wax, silks, spicery, woad, or such like stuffs; prohibited packing or peiling without the King's burghs, under pain of escheat of the goods; and empowered royal burghs or their commissioners to search unfreemen's goods, and to intromit therewith as escheat within the country, or in any other part. It declared that the privileges so extended were never in use, were highly prejudicial to the common interest of the kingdom, and far exceeded the ancient privileges of burghs, repeated and confirmed therein—applying to royal burghs exclusively the privileges granted to burghs generally, to the prejudice of burghs of regality and barony, and extending to the topping and retailing of imported commodities what could only be understood of wholesale. On the other hand the act declared that the just privileges of royal burghs had been encroached on by persons not only exporting but importing staple commodities without bearing burden with royal burghs in public taxations and aids to the King. It thereupon ordained that it should be the exclusive privilege of freemen of royal burghs, and of no other corporation or person, to buy or sell wholesale wine, wax, silks, spiceries, wald and other materials for dyeing, or to

¹ 1672, c. 5. Acts of Parliament, VIII., p. 63.

² *Antea*, pp. 79, 80.

import or export the same, and that no other incorporation or person should have power to import or export the same, or to import any other commodities, except such as were allowed them by the act, reserving the privilege of noblemen, prelates, barons, or others, to import any of these goods for the proper use of themselves and their families only. It declared, however, that any of the King's subjects, or any person who might buy from them, might export all kinds of cattle, nolt, sheep, and horses, coal, salt, and wool, skins and hides, and all other native commodities of the kingdom; and that it should be lawful to burghs of regality and barony, by any of their burgesses or members of society, to export all their own proper manufactures, and such goods as might be bought by them in fairs or markets. It also declared it to be lawful for burghs of regality and barony, or societies erected or to be erected for manufacture, and all others exporting the native growth of the kingdom, to import, in return for the exported goods or the fraught of the ships, the following goods, viz.:—timber, iron, tar, soap, lint, lintseed, hemp, onions, or other necessaries for tillage or building, or for the use of manufactories, and also to top and retail all kinds of commodities.¹ It further ordained that if any man, not being a freeman in the royal burghs, should be found to have in his possession any goods or commodities to be bought or sold, exported or imported, by him, contrary to this act, and the privileges of royal burghs granted by it, the whole goods should be escheat, one-half to the King and the other half to the burgh appreheimer; and that if such goods were apprehended within royal burghs or their suburbs or appendicles, or within their ports or harbours, they might be summarily seized and secured as goods escheat in manner aforesaid. But if such goods, competent only to freemen of royal burghs, should be found or be alleged to be found elsewhere, they should only be arrested and declared escheat by a competent judicature, as accords of law. The magistrates of burghs or others were, however, prohibited from searching or seizing upon any goods, or troubling or molesting His Majesty's subjects living without the bounds of their burghs or suburbs summarily, and by way of fact and only by legal process. All acts of parliament and ratifications, in so far as contrary to this statute, were annulled and rescinded.

On 8th June, 1675, the provost of Glasgow reported his having directed a summons to be brought against Greenock craving (1) decree against it for contravening the acts of parliament in favour of royal and free burghs by importing wine, brandy, and salt, such imports being the exclusive privilege of royal burghs; and (2) to have it found that for bygone contraventions the defenders had escheat their whole moveables to the King. Of that action the council approved, and ordered it to be prosecuted with diligence. He was also authorised

¹ Sir George MacKenzie observes that it was found that under this act burghs of regality and barony could not bring home wine, salt, or brandy; even as the return of their native commodities. Royal burghs alone could trade in these (*Works*, vol. I., p. 260).

to communicate with Dumbarton, with a view to its concurring in the proceedings.¹ On 22nd July he reported that he had joined with Dumbarton in seizing a ship belonging to Greenock which had imported goods contrary to the privileges of royal burghs, and a remit was made to the bailies and others to take such action as they might consider proper.² On 14th August a deputation was appointed to wait on the earl of Dundonald as to the Greenock dispute, which concerned all the royal burghs. On 21st August the dean of guild reported that the merchants' house had appointed two of its number to go to Edinburgh and bring the matter before the privy council, and the deacon-convenor reported similar action on the part of the crafts' house.³ It appears from an information as to the facts of this case, prepared for Glasgow, that, on 20th July, a ship belonging to Greenock, laden with salt, wine, and brandy—staple commodities—had been brought to a "roadstead" opposite the hill of Ardmore.⁴ While lying there the three burghs seized the ship, and took it into the harbour at Newark, where, calling the customs officers, they locked and sealed up the hatches. After the ship had been so taken possession of, however, the lairds of Greenock and James Bannatyne of Kellie, or at least the said James himself, with 100 or 150 armed men, opened a cellar in Greenock containing firelocks for the use of the Argyle militia, and, having armed themselves, went in six or seven boats to the ship, and called on the persons in charge to deliver it up to them. This being refused, as made without the semblance of warrant, eight persons entered the ship, while those in the boats shot at and wounded the keepers of the vessel. The keepers, however, succeeded in ejecting the eight who had boarded the ship, and in taking it into Dumbarton. A complaint was then made by the burghs to the privy council, craving that the committers of the riot might be punished, that the seizure of the ship should be declared legal, and that one-half of the goods should be held escheat to the Crown.⁵ What followed on the proceedings in the privy council is not stated, but on 9th September it was reported that the privy council had ordered an action to be instituted in the court of session against Greenock, and had appointed the lords of the treasury, or privy council, to be petitioned to get an act passed to oblige unfreemen and strangers to "liver and loaden" all vessels at Port-Glasgow, or ports belonging to royal burghs in the west.⁶ On 5th October the council resolved to ask the archbishop of Glasgow, who was about to proceed to London, to apply to the King and the duke of Lauderdale to get Greenock prohibited from exercising free trade, to the prejudice of Glasgow and the other western burghs.⁷

¹ Glasgow Records, III., p. 199; Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 191-2.

² Glasgow Records, III., p. 201.

³ *Ibid.*, III., pp. 202-3.

⁴ The reason for the vessel not having been brought into Greenock is stated to have been that there was no harbour or "havening places" at Greenock at that time.

⁵ Glasgow Records, III., pp. 261-3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, III., p. 208.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III., p. 203.

On 17th November a committee of the convention, considering that, upon pretence of the late act of parliament, burghs of regality and barony invade many privileges which are only competent by that act to royal burghs, ordained the act to be advised with the ablest lawyers. And in respect Glasgow and other burghs intended to pursue a declarator of their right before the lords of session, founded upon the act, it was declared that the expenses of the plea, which should be afterwards disbursed by them, should be on the common charges of the whole burghs. Their agent was accordingly ordained to concur in the affair, with the advice of Edinburgh, Perth, Linlithgow, and some adjacent burghs, which were empowered to determine the proper time for instituting the declarator. If, however, Glasgow should act contrary to their opinion, then the burghs should be free of its expenses.¹

On 1st December the provost of Glasgow, then in Edinburgh, was instructed to prosecute the case against Greenock with all diligence, and application was ordered to be made to Dumbarton for its concurrence and assistance.² The proceedings are again referred to on 5th November, 1676, when the provost was commissioned to proceed to Edinburgh and prosecute the plea.³ On 7th December the lords pronounced their decree, finding that the privileges of importing, with offer to free burghs, was competent only to strangers, and that none but free burgesses could import wine, brandy and salt. But, to prevent inconveniency, they appointed those of their number who were privy councillors to move that an act might be made to provide that all free burghs should provide salt for furnishing the country, the fishing, and other uses, and that the price should be determined by the council yearly, under sufficient penalties in case of transgression. They also found that the penalty on unfreemen importing was only the confiscation of the goods imported, and that the seizure or arrestment did only reach the same when found in the importer's possession, correcting the former abuse of seizing the same in other hands, but that the importer was still liable, by way of action, for confiscation of the goods imported or the value thereof, but no further.⁴ This judgment was reported by the provost to the council on his return from Edinburgh on 23rd December, 1676, and on the same day a deputation was appointed to give the archbishop thanks for his pains and care in the plea.⁵

On 3rd February, 1677, several inhabitants of Greenock, against whom this decree had been obtained, presented a supplication to Glasgow offering to give effect to the decree. The supplication was remitted to the magistrates and three others to meet the applicants and take trial of the verity of the affair, with

¹ Convention Records, III., pp. 656-7. This act was ratified by the convention on 7th July, 1676 (*Ibid.*, p. 665).

² Glasgow Records, III., p. 212.

³ *Ibid.* III., p. 227.

⁴ Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 188-204, No. 146; Morrison's Dict. of Decisions, p. 1908.

⁵ Glasgow Records, III., p. 228.

power to take their oaths for bygones, and bond and caution not to exercise any such trade thereafter. Power was also given “to score out of the summons” those who complied with this requirement.¹

In anticipation of Port-Glasgow being developed into a busy shipping port, it was resolved, on 9th September, 1675, to lease land there for a period of nineteen years, for the erection of houses for the accommodation of skippers, freemen, and others,² and on the 27th it was decided to build a breast-work at the harbour.³ This was followed on the same day by the presentation to the council of “Propositiounes as to Shipping,” prepared by the dean of guild and merchants, and by the deacon-convenor and craftsmen, with the advice of lawyers, and by the ratification and confirmation of the proposals by the council.⁴ The professed, and doubtless intended, object of these proposals was to promote the interests of the burgh, but they are interesting in the present day as setting forth the exclusive spirit of commercial enterprise at the time:—

To so promote trade that the town might reap some advantage ‘in recompence of the great waste and expenses’ it had been at in building the port and harbour, and dwelling-houses for the ship masters and mariners near where their ships lay, it was declared—(1) That no inhabitant of Glasgow should presume to load or unload any vessel at any port, harbour, or creek on the Clyde, save at Newport, or, in cases of necessity, at the ports of other royal burghs on the river. (2) That, inasmuch as the right to barrel or make fish, by which the boat coupers and other inhabitants of Glasgow and other royal burghs were employed, belonged exclusively by several acts of parliament to royal burghs, and that through the non-observance of these acts the burghs were prejudiced, no stranger should be employed to make herring or barrels, and that no burgess should pack or peil with unfreemen. (3) That no stranger or unfreeman should be employed in shipping belonging to the burgh, either as master or mariner, who did not belong to Port-Glasgow or any royal burgh, if they could be had there, and if they could not be so had, that the sanction of the magistrates should be first obtained; that all means should be used to induce the persons so employed to reside in Glasgow or Port-Glasgow, or such other royal burghs as these in which there were ships to be loaded or unloaded—the object of this regulation being to secure that the ship might be taken better care of, and especially in time of storms. (4) That such of the incorporations as hired skippers and seamen should endeavour to hire them without giving them portage, and that when this could not be done, that the skippers and mariners should be obliged to make the first offer of the portage to the owners or freighters who hired them, and that, if this could not be agreed upon, that they should be obliged to make sale thereof to no persons save freemen of royal burghs. (5) That no member of the incorporations hire any ship or vessel save from freemen and burgesses of royal burghs, if such can be had, and that, if not, the magistrates’ permission for such hiring be previously obtained. (6) That every merchant or craftsman who violated any of these provisions should pay £500 Scots to the merchants’ house or crafts’ house for the use of the poor, and remain in prison till the same was paid, besides losing his burgess-ship and the freedom of the burgh.”

¹ Glasgow Records, III., p. 230.

² *Ibid.*, III., p. 203.

³ *Ibid.*, III., p. 204.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III., p. 205.

On 2nd October these regulations were applied to John Cors, a merchant, who, without previously obtaining the sanction of the magistrates, had hired and employed a Greenock boat, though of necessity. On the same day the terms were fixed on which ground could be got at Newport for building houses.¹

On 23rd October articles were submitted to the council to be observed “anent ordering the harbour and house at Newport,” and were remitted to a committee for revisal.²

On 5th February, 1676, Glasgow entered into a contract with John Clark, mason, to build the bulwark at Newport and other works, at a cost of 17,000 merks [£944 8s. 10d. sterling] and two chalders of victual.³ On 11th April, the provost reported arrangements he had made with Sir Patrick Maxwell as to the town winning stones out of his quarry at Newport for the building of houses there.⁴ On the same day three “rowmes” at Newport were ordered to be given to the tacksmen of the customs and excise for a customs office, and a person was to be appointed to keep the store cellars and their contents.⁵

On 20th May reference is made to a proposal by Glasgow to Dumbarton to the effect that the burgesses of both burghs should be made free each of the other.⁶

On 15th January, 1675, the Convention of Burghs had under consideration a petition by the provost of Glasgow in relation to the condition of that burgh, but referred its consideration till the next convention, when, on 6th July, 1676, Glasgow craved authority to sell portions of its common mure for the improvement of the common good and relief of the poor. The convention approved of the sale of three pieces of land at “Liddells Bog and the Kows lair.”⁷

On 9th January, 1677, authority was given to purchase 400 or 500 oak trees in Waterford, Ireland, for the breast-work at Newport, and to freight a vessel to carry them over.⁸ On 24th February proclamation was ordered inviting offers to feu ground at Newport for houses, cellars, &c., authorising oak trees to be got, and ordering an inspection of the buildings then existing, &c.⁹

On 7th July, 1677, the lords of the treasury and exchequer, on the application of Glasgow, passed an act ordaining all goods and merchandise which royal burghs were then privileged to export and import, and which might afterwards be exported and imported to the Clyde, to be loaded and unloaded at Port-Glasgow,

¹ Glasgow Records, III., p. 207. These terms, as reported on 9th May, 1676, were submitted to merchants and craftsmen, and they were satisfied with them (*Ibid.*, III., p. 220).

² *Ibid.*, III., p. 209.

³ *Ibid.*, III., p. 215. Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 185-7, No. 145. Clark having died, Robert Boyd, mason, carried out the contract, the total cost of which, and of additional works, was £13,520 Scots (£1,126 13s. 6d. sterling). *Ibid.*, pp. 187-8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III., p. 219.

⁷ Convention Records, III., p. 660.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III., pp. 219-20.

⁸ Glasgow Records, III., p. 229.

⁶ Irving's Dumbarton Records, p. 87.

⁹ *Ibid.*, III., pp. 231, 235-6.

and at no other port or creek, except what is allowed to burghs and baronies by Act of Parliament,¹

On 25th August, 1677, the town council, giving effect to an act made by them on 5th October, 1667, appointing a book to be kept for the entry of ships,² directed Thomas Young to take charge of the town's salt firlots at Newport, and to take entry of all ships that came to the Clyde, levying specified dues on them from the burgesses of Glasgow and Dumbarton, and double the amount from strangers.³

On 4th January, 1679, the provost, reporting to the council his diligence in Edinburgh about the town's affairs, produced a copy of an interlocutor in an action against Greenock.⁴ This action may have been that reported in Morrison, under date 20th December, 1678. It appears to have been against the unfreemen of Greenock for exercising freemen's trade, proper only to freemen in royal burghs, and claiming that goods exported or imported by them were to be confiscated—one half to the King, the other half to the burgh apprehender. This action was fully defended, and the lords found that Glasgow could have no action for confiscation unless there had been a preceding seizure when the goods were within burgh, or arrestment without the burgh, the goods in both cases being in the possession of the importer or exporter. They found that those who did export or import, without lawful entry, were still to be presumed as possessors, for *pro possessore habetur qui dolo desit possidere*, and that arrestment might be made in their hands at any time, as if the goods were actually in their hands. But where entries were lawfully made, that the burghs apprehenders behoved to arrest in the hands of unfreemen, importers or exporters, or in the hands of freemen who traded in trust for unfreemen's behoof, which could easily be done by

¹ Inventory of Glasgow Charters, &c., I., bundle 3, No. 6; Glasgow Records, III., p. 239; Glasgow Charters, II., p. 371, No. 824.

² Glasgow Records, III., p. 99. *Antea*, p. 107.

³ *Ibid.*, III., p. 239. In 1677 Thomas Kirk of Cookridge visited Scotland, and towards the end of his journey arrived in Glasgow, which he describes as "the prettiest town" (*Tours in Scotland*). Professor Hume Brown's edition, p. 45). The Professor adds—"all the travellers who visited Scotland in the 17th century agree that Glasgow was the prettiest town in the country." In 1681 the English antiquarian, Ralph Thoresby, visited Glasgow, which he describes as "a very pleasant city, far exceeding Edinburgh itself in the situation and cleanliness" (*Ibid.*, p. 53).

Encouraged by the acts of parliament passed for the establishment of manufactories in Scotland, Frederick Hamilton and John Corse, and their partners, established two sugar works at Glasgow, which they craved parliament to declare to be manufactories, with all the privileges and immunities specified in these acts. This desire parliament granted on the 17th of September, 1681, on the report of the lords of the articles (c. 103. *Acts of Parliament*, p. 360). On the same day the woollen work of serge, called Scarge de Mein, erected by James Armour in Glasgow, was also declared to be a manufactory in terms of the acts of parliament (c. 104. *Ibid.*, p. 361. *Glasgow Charters*, II., pp. 214-7, Nos. 149-50).

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 260-3.

the King's waiters wherever entries were made, if the burghs suspected unfree-men's trade.¹

In the course, apparently, of 1679, one of the bailies of Glasgow seized some leather which had been imported by two Greenock men (James and Thomas Rankine), who were not freemen of any royal burgh, and Sir John Shaw of Greenock, their superior, craved its return, but this was refused by the town council on 19th July, 1679.² This state of matters and the decisions of the courts to which reference has been made may have satisfied Sir John and his townsmen that nothing was to be gained by further litigation, and that the most expedient course was to effect an arrangement with the royal burghs. So, at the particular convention held on 3rd December, 1679, it was reported that Greenock had submitted to the convention all differences with Glasgow. The commissioners for Edinburgh and seven other burghs—four to be a quorum—were accordingly appointed to meet at Glasgow on the second Tuesday of March following to settle the differences as in justice they should think fit.³ This was reported to the town council by the provost on 23rd December.⁴

In virtue of this commission several of the commissioners met at the appointed time and place, and, of consent of both the parties, the consideration of the subject was postponed till the 18th of May and subsequent days. The whole subject was then gone into, and the allegations and pleadings of the two burghs were heard. The complaint of Glasgow was to the effect that a number of persons resident in Greenock had, during the years 1662 and 1679, and intermediate years, imported the quantities of prohibited goods specified, and it was alleged that these persons, or some of them, had, by money sent abroad, bills of exchange drawn at home, and otherwise, imported deal boards, oak trees, fir trees, iron, soap, lintseed, hemp, lint, and divers other goods and merchandise, to the value of £12,000 Scots yearly, and vented and sold the same within the kingdom, to the prejudice of the royal burghs, and specially of Glasgow. It was also alleged that Thomas and James Rankin had imported from Ireland three score dakers⁵ of tanned leather, which could only legally be imported by burgesses of royal burghs, and had sold the same in Glasgow. Of that leather forty dakers had been seized by Glasgow, conform to act of parliament. Glasgow, therefore, claimed to have the provisions of the acts of parliament applied to the persons complained against, and to Sir John Shaw as cautioner for them. When required by the arbiters to give in any claim he desired to prefer against Glasgow, Sir John stated that he had no claim against it since the decree of the court of session, save that the inhabitants of Greenock were daily vexed and molested with summonses, charges of horning, and other letters and diligences, and by the seizure of the leather referred to.

¹ Morrison's Dictionary of Decisions, pp. 1910-16.

² Glasgow Records, III., p. 268.

³ Convention Records, IV., p. 17.

⁴ Glasgow Records, III., p. 275.

⁵ Daiker. Ten hides makis ane daiker, and twenty daikers makis ane last [Skene].

The whole case being then considered by the arbiters, they decided that the seizure of the leather complained of had been lawfully and orderly made, but they recommended the Rankins to the favour of Glasgow "for this time," and ordained the inhabitants of Greenock to desist from importing leather in all time to come. In reference to the rest of the claim against Greenock, for importing goods and merchandise the importation of which by law belongs to the royal burghs, and for importing goods allowed by law to be imported by burghs of barony, and alleged to be imported by Greenock men by money sent outward, bills of exchange, or otherwise contrary to the tenor of the act, the arbiters, for keeping peace and concord between the towns, and saving unnecessary trouble and expense of legal proceedings, ordained Glasgow to cease molesting the persons complained of for any of the goods imported by them preceding the date of the decree arbitral, the leather excepted. In time to come, with consent of parties, Glasgow was ordained not to trouble any of the inhabitants of Greenock for contravening acts of parliament till it first represented to Sir John Shaw the names of the persons of whom it complained and of what it complained, and that Sir John should thereupon either cause them to find caution to give Glasgow satisfaction or put them out of Greenock and all liberty thereof, after which Glasgow should have power to arrest all goods so imported or exported, and recover the value thereof from the delinquents, whether arrested or not. In case the goods could be apprehended in Greenock or any jurisdiction thereof, Sir John should cause the same or their value to be forthcoming to Glasgow; and all inhabitants of Greenock, importers or exporters, under colour of other men's names, should be in the same condition as if they themselves imported or exported.¹ On 28th August, 1680, Glasgow resolved to give back to the Rankines the city's half of the leather which had been seized, on payment to Glasgow of £50, and remitted for consideration the fittest way to get an order for getting back the other half belonging to the King.²

On 11th January, 1681, one of the bailies was appointed to consult Mr. Withers, who was building a ship at Hamilton, as to the making of a "weiz"³ at Newark, for docking ships there, and, if he thought fit, to employ him to do the work.⁴ On 1st March the council resolved to construct the weiz, and also to build a smithy;⁵ and on 21st May four persons were authorised to arrange for the timber necessary for the making of the weiz, to pay for making it, and also to see as to the completion of the smithy.⁶

¹ Glasgow Charters, No. CXLVII., Vol. II., pp. 204 213. Glasgow Records, III., p. 283.

² Glasgow Records, III., p. 283. The rigour with which this restrictive legislation was applied is shown by an act of council on 1st March, 1681, which ordained six barrels of rynd tallow, seized by one of the bailies on exportation, "against the laws of the kingdom and the acts of the burgh," to be roused, and the proceeds to be applied by the dean of guild and deacon-convener for the use of the poor of their respective hospitals (*Ibid.*, III., 291).

³ "Weiz," apparently a structure to divert water.

⁴ Glasgow Records, III., p. 289.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III., p. 290.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III., p. 295. On 27th September authority was given for payment of £720 Scots (£60 sterling) for timber, and £5 sterling "to Mr. Withers for making the said weiz" (*Ibid.*, p. 302).

For some reason the Greenock leather appears not to have been restored, and an appeal was made to the lords of the treasury, whose order was produced to Glasgow on 26th March, 1681, appointing the leather to be delivered to the Rankines on their finding caution to answer for what the town might lay to their charge. Notwithstanding this act, however, Sir John Shaw, for himself and the Rankines, referred themselves to the magistrates, and agreed to pay such fine as they pleased to exact, before the leather was given up. Thereupon the fine previously fixed was adhered to, and on payment of it and the delivery up of the act of the lords of the treasury, the leather was appointed to be handed back. Thereafter, it was added, the magistrates and council "will tak them to consideration for the said fyne."¹ On 30th April £200 Scots of the fine, when paid, was ordered to be applied for helping to relieve a prisoner with the Turks from slavery,² and on 25th November the balance of the fine was similarly applied.³

On 6th September, 1681, an act of parliament ratified to Sir John Shaw of Greenock the charter granted on 11th July, 1670, by King Charles II. to his father in life-rent, and himself in fee, of the lands and barony of Greenock, including the burgh of barony, but reserving to Margaret Crawford, lady Kilbirnie, and her husband the forty shilling land of Cartsburn, with the privilege and liberty of a weekly market and two yearly fairs, and all the other powers and privileges thereby conferred.⁴

The exclusive privileges of trade which royal burghs enjoyed in consideration of their obligations to the state did not secure them against having their privileges invaded by burghs of barony and regality and others. These invasions were often made with the consent or connivance of royal burghs, and scarcely a convention of these burghs was held in which fines were not imposed on its members for active or passive violations of these privileges, or injunctions to adopt vigorous measures to enforce them. Frequent references are also made to grants from the Crown of charters of regality or barony to influential landowners, who thus obtained privileges which encroached on those of the royal burghs. The system of exclusive privileges, instituted in early times when trade and manufactories were in their infancy, could obviously not be maintained under an advancing civilisation and a growing trade, and this the legislature could not fail to recognise. So at last it had to address itself to providing a remedy. It was not an easy task, for the royal burghs had just claims, based not only on centuries of privilege, but on obligations to the state imposed and resting on them in consequence of these obligations, and what was necessary was to deal equitably with them, while meeting the conflicting requirements of the country clamorous for expansion. Some kind of equitable adjustment was necessary, and to that

¹ Glasgow Records, III., p. 291.

⁴ 1681, c. 76. Acts of Parliament, VIII.,

² *Ibid.*, III., p. 292.

pp. 344-7.

³ *Ibid.*, III., pp. 307-8.

the Parliament at the close of the seventeenth century had to address itself.

On 8th July, 1680, the convention revived all former acts by general and particular conventions, by which the loading and livering of all goods, declared by act of parliament to be the proper subject of the trade of the royal burghs, is discharged to be at the ports and harbours of burghs of barony and regality and other unfree places. All burgesses of royal burghs were also prohibited to load or liver goods elsewhere than at the ports of free royal burghs, under pain of 500 merks *toties quoties*. All burgesses of royal burghs were also prohibited to keep part of any ships belonging to burghs of barony and regality under the same penalty, and the magistrates of every burgh were also appointed to make acts in their town council books to that effect.¹

On 25th July, 1681, the convention of burghs resolved unanimously to address his Majesty's high commissioner, and represent, *inter alia*, "the heavy prejudice the royal burghs lies under by having their privilege of trade communicate to the burghs of regality and barony, and by erecting the fishing companie."²

On 29th August an offer was made to Glasgow, by one Richard Bucklie, of a large quantity of tobacco in leaf, roll, and in bulk, at specified prices. Dumbarton having renounced its part, Bucklie was required before answer to place the tobacco in cellar in Glasgow, and to make oath as to whether he had sold or offered it to any others. Though no farther reference is made to this tobacco, the above passage illustrates the system of exclusive dealing then in practice.³

In 1682 the privy council appointed a voluntary contribution to be raised for building a stone bridge on the water of Leven, near Dumbarton, and on 7th July of that year the convention recommended the act to the next convention.⁴

On 22nd April, 1683, the condition of the waterworks at the middle of the Broad Meadow, opposite the stream, again occupied the attention of the council. The south end of the meadow was so worn away by the river that "the very channel was worne in beneath the brae (on which the collegiate church of St. Mary stood), and a bark sunken up upon the west side, quhilk has casten the whole river over to the east syde, and if remeid were not instantly found it would very soon be in upon the kills at the toun heid." The master of works was accordingly ordered to execute certain works to meet the threatened danger.⁵ On an appeal from Dumbarton, Glasgow, on 5th May, ordained a contribution to be levied throughout the town to aid in building the bridge, on the condition, however, that the burgesses and inhabitants and their goods should be free of any duty in coming or going along the bridge in all time coming, and on such other terms as might be agreed upon between the two burghs.⁶ On 4th July, 1684, the convention continued consideration of the matter, but recommended each burgh to

¹ Convention Records, IV., p. 24.

⁵ MacLeod's Ancient Records of Dumbar-

² *Ibid.*, IV., p. 25.

tonshire, pp. 25, 26.

³ Glasgow Records, III., p. 300.

⁶ Glasgow Records, III., p. 330.

⁴ Convention Records, IV., pp. 34-5.

pay its part of the contribution.¹ The conditions on which Glasgow had agreed to contribute had evidently been adjusted with Dumbarton, for on 26th October, 1685, the contributions collected in the town were ordered to be called in and delivered to the treasurer.² On 7th July the convention desired those burghs who had not already made the voluntary contribution to Dumbarton to do so.³

On 1st July, 1684, the somewhat curious entry appears in the council records of Glasgow that "it does not consist with the knowledge of the magistrates and council who is bailie of the regality of Glasgow." In consequence, the fair for that year was proclaimed in the names of the King, the archbishop, and the magistrates, "without naming any bailie of the regality."⁴

¹ Convention Records, IV., p. 48.

³ Convention Records, IV., p. 65.

² Glasgow Records, III., p. 382.

⁴ Glasgow Records, III., p. 318. This uncertainty may be explained by the following facts:—In 1672, Charles, sixth duke of Lennox died, and the heritable office of bailie of the regality of Glasgow, with the dukedom and other possessions reverted to King Charles II. He thereupon granted the bailiary to William, duke of Hamilton, who held it till his death in 1694. After him, says M'Ure, the office was conferred on lord Boyle, earl of Glasgow, and was subsequently held by the duke of Montrose. In 1680 the king granted the bailiary to his natural son, Charles, duke of Lennox and Richmond, to be held of the archbishop under reservation of the liferent grant to William, duke of Hamilton. This charter was confirmed by parliament on 6th September, 1681 (Acts of Parliament, VIII., pp. 251-2). But while these arrangements apparently still subsisted the town council, on 25th April, 1682, received a letter from the marquis of Montrose intimating his appointment to the office (Glasgow Records, III., pp. 311-3).

VII.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF KING JAMES VII. TILL THE UNION, 1685-1707.

On 15th January, 1687, Glasgow obtained from King James VII. a gift by which, in consideration of the great losses which the city had sustained during the “late rebellions,” the services which it had rendered to the royal service, its losses through fires, &c., he granted it an impost of four pence Scots on every pint of ale and beer brewed or brought in and sold in the city and its suburbs, or, at the option of the magistrates, to exact and receive the imposition either as mentioned or at the rate of two merks Scots on each boll of malt, payable by the brewers in the city or suburbs. Also an impost of £50 Scots on each tun of Spanish wine or each butt of French or Rhenish wine, and on each tun of brandy, aquavitæ, or strong waters; and twenty shillings on each barrel of mum beer sold in the city, to be paid by the sellers of these commodities. Such imposts to be without prejudice to the ordinary excise and annuity granted to the Crown by act of parliament. The above imposts to endure for nineteen years from 1687.¹

The misgovernment under Charles II. and James VII.—as evidenced in interference with the freedom of municipal elections, the discontent excited by the re-establishment of episcopacy, the high-handed measures by which nonconformity was punished, the imposition of penalties on the city and the regality for the failure of the authorities to suppress conventicles, and the introduction into Glasgow of the “Highland Host” to crush presbyterian meetings—and the injury to the town by a great fire in 1677, all seem to have thrown back the growth of the city for a time, and explain the fact that at the Revolution in 1688 the population numbered only 11,948, a decrease in twenty-eight years of 2,730. At the convention on 5th July, 1688, Glasgow represented its former flourishing condition as compared with its then depressed state, occasioned by the great addition to its burdens within the previous three years, making the then amount £1,250 sterling yearly, or thereby. For several years its trade had been sadly decaying, and was then inconsiderable. The decay of its fishing also was a universal discouragement to the inhabitants. The convention was, therefore, craved to appoint three or four of its number to visit the burgh and inquire into

¹ Glasgow Charters, II., p. 229, No. 154.

its condition. Eight commissioners, or any four of them, were accordingly appointed to take trial of the matter and report to the next convention. Similar committees were also appointed to enquire and report as to the condition of Rutherglen and other burghs, and 500 merks Scots were granted to Renfrew towards the rebuilding of its tolbooth.¹

On 6th July, 1688, Irvine represented to the convention that it had become "mightyly depauperat through the absolute decay of trade these many years bygane, mostly occasioned through the want of a safe harbour, which the burgh was not able to repair." Nine commissioners were accordingly appointed to investigate the condition of the burgh and harbour, and to report.² What the result of this remit was does not appear. It may have been superseded by the general remit made by the following convention.

On 18th October, 1688, King James VI. granted a Letter of Gift to Irvine, by which he empowered it, in consequence of its poverty by the decay and ruin of its bridge and quay, &c., to levy an imposition on ale or beer brewed, imported or sold within the burgh, and on wine, for a period of nineteen years.³

On 11th April, 1689, the declaration of the estates of the kingdom, containing the claim of right and the offer of the crown to the King and Queen of England, set forth that prelacy and the superiority of any office in the church above presbyters is and hath been a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation (they having been reformed from popery by presbyters), and therefore ought to be abolished.⁴ And that declaration was followed on 22nd July, 1689, by the act of parliament, 1689, c. 4,⁵ which, reciting the above declaration, abolished prelacy and all superiority of any office in the church above presbyters, and rescinded and annulled the act 1662, c. 3 [intituled an act for the restitution and re-establishment of the ancient government of the church by arch-bishops and bishops];⁶ the act 1663, c. 9 [intituled an act against separation and disobedience to ecclesiastical authority];⁷ and the act 1681, c. 4 [intituled an act for securing the peace of the country];⁸ and all other acts, statutes, and constitutions, in so far as they were inconsistent with the act 1689, c. 4, and established prelacy and the superiority of church officers above presbyters.

Having enjoyed the benefits of good government and open trade under the Protectorate, and suffered from the intolerance which prevailed during the reigns of Charles II. and James VII., Scotland was not to be satisfied with a commercial position less free than that of England. The burghal system of exclusive privilege cramped the commercial energies of the nation, and its restraints were in process

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 77-8.

⁵ 1689, c. 4. *Ibid.*, IX., p. 104.

² *Ibid.*, IV., p. 79.

⁶ 1662, c. 3. *Ibid.*, VII., p. 372. Glasgow

Charters, II., pp. 46-50, No. 133.

³ Muniments of Irvine, I., 112.

⁴ 1689, c. 28. Acts of Parliament, IX., pp. 38, 40.

⁷ 1663, c. 9. Acts of Parliament, VII., p. 455.

⁸ 1681, c. 4. *Ibid.*, VIII., p. 242.

of relaxation, but, outside of these, free trade with Holland and other nations had been cultivated. What she therefore desired at this time was, as Burton puts it, either to participate in the extended commerce and colonial privileges of England, or to have a separate commercial dominion of her own. After the Revolution, King William recognised, along with Marlborough, that the only safety for Scotland was a legislative Union, and in his first communication to the Scottish parliament he earnestly drew their attention to the advantages of a Union. The Scots appointed commissioners to transact it, but, says Burton, there was no inclination for such a measure on the part of England. The sensitiveness of the country and its statesmen on the sacredness of their trading policy made them shudder to approach the subject. But, he adds, “the government difficulties increased, and the attitude of Scotland became gradually so hostile and so fierce that England was at last compelled not only to admit, but to court, this disagreeable alternative.”¹

On 24th June, 1689, the high commissioner and privy council of Scotland, in obedience to a letter from the King, authorised a free election—by poll of the “habile burgesses bearing burden, scot and lot, but excluding honorary burgesses, towns servants, pensioners, and beadmen”—of the bailies, dean of guild, treasurer, and town council of Glasgow, on 2nd and 3rd July. The persons so elected were appointed to send to the King the names of three persons, of whom he might choose one to be provost. A royal commissioner was appointed to attend and see the election carried out, and the town-clerk was charged with the conduct of the election.²

On 26th August, John Anderson of Dowhill was appointed by the town council of Glasgow to go to London and petition the King to get the election of the provost and bailies in their own hands (bishops now being abolished), in conformity with the act of the estates as regards other burghs.³ In this mission he was so far successful that on 19th September, 1689, King William granted a letter to the magistrates and town council of Glasgow empowering them to choose and elect their magistrates for the ensuing year,⁴ and it was produced on 1st October, previous to the election of the provost and bailies.

On 12th November a merchant was fined £20 sterling for buying a quantity of indigo within Glasgow's bounds of the Clyde, without allowing the importer to offer it to the town, and refusing still so to offer it.⁵

On 4th January, 1690, King William and Queen Mary granted a charter to Glasgow under the great seal, by which they confirmed the rights and privileges of the city, including the right to elect its own magistrates as freely as any other

¹ Burton, VII., p. 331.

⁴ Glasgow Charters, II., p. 235, No. 157.

² Glasgow Records, III., 425-7.

Glasgow Records, III., pp. 429, 433-5.

³ *Ibid.*, III., p. 429.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III., p. 436. In 1689, Thomas Morer, who was chaplain to a Scottish regiment and afterwards minister of St. Ann's within Aldersgate, visited Glasgow, which, he says, is a

royal burgh.¹ The letter of gift on which this charter proceeded was produced by the provost to the council on 18th January,² and the charter itself on 24th February, 1690.³ The charter was sent to Edinburgh on 21st April to obtain the confirmation of parliament, and it was so ratified on 14th June.⁴

On 14th June an act of the parliament of William and Mary was passed in favour of the royal burghs. It proceeded on the narrative that the trade allowed to burghs of barony and regality had not been so cleared as to prevent the daily rise of many controversies thereupon, to the great prejudice of the trade of the kingdom; that the royal burghs, being one of the estates of the kingdom, and bearing a sixth of all public impositions, were obliged to watch, ward, build and maintain prison houses, with several other obligations for support of the royal government; that, in consideration of these, many repeated laws had granted them the power of trade within and without the kingdom; and that it was then fit, after full trial of all former expedients, that all controversies about trade should be clearly determined. It was, therefore, ordained (1) that the importing of all foreign commodities and merchandise, either by sea or land, should belong exclusively to the freemen inhabitants of royal burghs, excepting only cattle, horses, sheep, and other bestial, and also excepting such commodities as noblemen and barons should import for their own use, and of which no part should be imported for sale; (2) that the exporting by sea of all native commodities of the kingdom should belong to the freemen inhabitants of royal burghs, except corn, cattle, horses, sheep, metals, minerals, coals, salt, lime, and stone, without prejudice to noblemen and barons exporting as much of the other native products of the kingdom, whether staple commodities or others, as might answer to the value of the commodities imported by them for their own use. As also without prejudice to all the lieges to transport by land, out of the kingdom, all the native commodities thereof. Contravengers of this act were to be punished according to the tenor of the acts against unfree traders in all points. It was, however, declared that the inhabitants of burghs of regality and barony and others might trade in buying and selling all

place of great extent and good situation, and has the reputation of the finest town in Scotland, not excepting Edinburgh, the royal city. The two main streets are made cross-wise, well paved and bounded with stately buildings, especially about the centre, where they are mostly new, with piazzas under them. . . . The river is a great current called the Clyde, and conduces much to the riches of the inhabitants, and makes it the most considerable town of that nation (Early Travellers in Scotland, p. 288).

¹ Glasgow Charters, II., p. 236, No. 158.

³ *Ibid.*, III., p. 442.

² Glasgow Records, III., p. 438.

⁴ 1690, c. 18. Acts of Parliament, IX., pp. 152-3. Glasgow Charters, II., p. 239, No. 159. See also Glasgow Records, III., pp. 447-8, 453-6. The accounts of the burgh for 1690 bear that £3,729 Scots (£310 15s. 6d. sterling), were paid to the provost, John Anderson, for his expenses in London, and in riding post up and down, and otherwise expended by him for getting this gift (Glasgow Records, III., p. 517); also, £681 12s. Scots (£56 15s. 6d. sterling) for other expenses connected with the gift (*Ibid.*, p. 518).

native commodities, and might retail all foreign commodities, provided these were bought from freemen of the royal burghs, bearing scot and lot, and that notwithstanding the act 1672, c. 5,¹ which was thereby restricted expressly, and abrogated in so far only as was inconsistent with the act of 1690.²

On 12th July the convention of burghs, for the better execution of the act 1690, c. 15, ordained that no burgess of any royal burgh should buy from any unfree-man foreign goods imported for retailing again, except from such strangers as first made offer of their goods to the magistrates and town council of any royal burgh in whole bulk, certifying that such freemen as contravened this act or any part of it should be liable to the burghs in the fourth part of the value of the goods so bought.³

On the 19th of the same month an act of parliament, referring to the declaration of the states of the kingdom, and to the act of parliament in 1689 abolishing the office of bishops or prelates, ordained that all the superiorities which formerly belonged to prelates and bishops and chapters, and deans, sub-deans, and arch-deans, or other beneficed persons, did then belong and should thereafter pertain immediately to their Majesties and their successors in all time coming, and that the vassals of these lands, mills, fishings, heritable offices, and others, while formerly held immediately of the said prelates, bishops, and others, should in all time coming hold of their Majesties and their successors in the same form and manner of holding as they formerly held of the said prelates and others, conform to the infestments and rights made and pertaining to the vassals, which were thereby declared to be unprejudiced by the abolition of the prelates, bishops, and others, their former superiors. It, moreover, declared that it should not be lawful to interpose any other superior between their Majesties and any of these vassals.⁴

On 6th September the town council of Glasgow, considering that, notwithstanding the act of parliament 1690, c. 15, above referred to, the inhabitants of Greenock and others on the coast side were sending out vessels and using free trade, though neither residents in nor freemen of Glasgow or any other burgh, appointed a committee to confer with the town council of Dumbarton, and afterwards to repair with such persons as it might appoint to Greenock, and investigate the whole matter, and do whatever might be necessary to enforce the provisions of the statute.⁵

On the 6th of the following month of October, Glasgow appointed John Crawford, one of its former bailies, to exercise the office of bailie of the Newport. This appointment bears to have been made in consequence "of several abuses done and committed" in that town, "and the key and harbour thereof being spoiled through want of some fit person to oversee the same as bailie there." The powers

¹ 1672, c. 5. Acts of Parliament, VIII., p. 63. *Antea*, pp. 112-3.

² 1690, c. 15. *Ibid.*, IX., pp. 152-3.

³ Convention Records, IV., pp. 118-9.

⁴ 1690, c. 59. Acts of Parliament, IX., p. 199. Glasgow Charters, II., p. 241,

No. 161.

⁵ Glasgow Records, III., pp. 459-60.

conferred on him were those of a baron bailie, subject to his observing such instructions as were given to him from time to time by the magistrates and town council of Glasgow.¹

On the 6th of the following month of April, it having been reported to the town council of Glasgow that a ship's loading of tobacco had been imported from Liverpool by a stranger, and bought by William Corse, Frederick Cunningham, and others, and disposed of by them without previously offering it to the town in accordance with the laws of the kingdom and the constitution of the royal burghs, the purchasers were ordered to be cited before the council at the instance of the procurator-fiscal, with a view to their being proceeded against conform to law.²

On 6th March, 1691, the town council of Glasgow commissioned John Anderson of Dowhill, provost, and the deacon convener, to meet at Edinburgh on 10th March with the committee of the burghs appointed by the general convention in July as to burghs of barony and regality.³

On 10th July, 1691, the convention of burghs, referring to the acts of parliament and burghs against burgesses of free burghs packing and peeling with unfreemen, or being partners with them in trade or shipping, and prohibiting burgesses to load or unload boats at ports not belonging to free burghs, all of which acts had not been put to effectual execution; and, being resolved not to suffer the privileges of royal burghs to be longer abused by burgesses joining stocks with unfreemen inhabitants in burghs of regality and barony and other unfree places, in point both of trade and shipping, by which action unfreemen receive encouragement from freemen in royal burghs to trade and the privileges of the royal burghs are destroyed, the convention therefore, not only renewed and revised all former acts of convention of burghs of whatsoever date, tenor, or contents in any way relating to the premises (except in so far as innovated by this act), but likewise ordained that none of the burgesses of free royal burghs should in future be partners with unfreemen inhabitants in regalities, baronies, or other unfree places, either in point of trade and merchandise or in the matter of shipping, under the pain of 500 merks, to be paid by each burgess and freeman of a royal burgh as oft as he should be found guilty by the respective dean of guild, or by the magistrates where there is no dean of guild—the one-half of the fine to belong to the dean of guild or magistrate for his own use, and the other half to be paid to the agent for the use of the royal burghs. The commissioners of burghs were also required, when appointed, to produce to the general convention yearly a list of the burghs in which the fines were imposed. Further,

¹ Glasgow Records, III., p. 466.

² Glasgow Records, IV., p. 7. On 15th May William Corse and his partners were ordered to be cited to appear before the magistrates and town council with a view to their being fined and punished for their transgression (*Ibid.*, IV., p. 24).

³ Glasgow Records, IV., p. 6.

the convention prohibited and discharged the burgesses of royal burghs to load or unload their ships and vessels at any ports other than those belonging to free royal burghs, except as to such goods as unfree traders might export by law. Those burghs that had not free ports were required to load and unload at the next free port adjacent to them, under a penalty for each transgression. Further, the convention, for several weighty and pungent considerations moving them, strictly prohibited and discharged the burgesses of free royal burghs to freight and hire any ships or vessels belonging to the inhabitants of regalities, baronies, or other unfree places within the kingdom, either for export or import, under the penalty of 500 merks—the one-half to the discoverer and the other half to the agent for the use of the burghs. And, lastly, considering that it would take some time for freemen burgesses to dissolve the copartnuries betwixt them and unfreemen, and to withdraw the stocks had with them in trade and shipping, and to provide for themselves shipping wherein no person should have interest save burgesses resident within royal burghs, the convention therefore allowed freemen burgesses until the first of March following to do the same, after which time punctual and exact obedience and observance to this act was required, under the certification above mentioned. This act was ordained to be printed and published at the market crosses of all the royal burghs, that none might pretend ignorance.¹

On 16th July the convention considered the result of the conferences which had taken place with the representatives of the unfree burghs. Of these, Greenock was the only one of the Clyde burghs which had appeared, but it refused “to condescend and liquidate what proportion of burden it would undertake.” The committee, therefore, recommended that every royal burgh should take the best means it could for putting the act of parliament in execution against its next adjacent burghs of regality and barony. The convention, however, gave these burghs an opportunity of meeting, when, among others, Sir John Shaw, younger of Greenock, appeared, and offered for Greenock to pay such proportion of burden as, after valuation, it ought to pay. But he would not condescend on an amount. Under these circumstances, the convention resolved that, while the offer made by him was “mor ingenuous and poynted than the rest, yet in regard he wold not liquidat his offer, and that the same wes bot a single unfrie burgh, whose proportion will doe little to ease the wholl royall borrowes, and that it tends to destroy the interest of Glasgow, which is the second trading royall burgh of the kingdome, they cannot acquiesce to the said offer.” While, therefore, thanking the committee for what it had done, the convention declared the treaty with the unfree burghs to be closed, and authorised the royal burghs, and each one of them, to execute the acts of parliament in their favour against the next adjacent burghs of regality, barony and other

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 133-4.

unfree places. In respect, however, of the singularity of Greenock's offer, the royal burghs nearest to Greenock were recommended to deal discreetly with its inhabitants in executing the act of parliament till the next general convention.¹ Communications appear subsequently to have taken place between Sir John and a committee of the convention, which resulted in his being allowed liberty of trade for Greenock till the next convention.² Notwithstanding this, Glasgow took action against several townsmen of Greenock who had exported herrings. Sir John thereupon craved the convention to appoint two of its number to continue the negotiations with him, and meanwhile to reprimand Glasgow for its action. The convention thereupon appointed two of its members to continue the negotiations, and ordered all proceedings by Glasgow to be stopped, Sir John undertaking to pay whatsoever proportion of the tax roll might subsequently be stmented upon Greenock by the convention.³ On 4th July, 1693, the two commissioners appointed to confer with Sir John having reported as to the trade and condition of Greenock, the convention remitted to its agent to settle with Sir John or his burgh as to their trade, and the quota to be paid by them, as he could best agree."⁴ Under this remit an arrangement appears to have been effected. On 13th July, 1697, Sir John applied to the convention to be allowed to vote in its proceedings. This, however, the convention could not allow, "but in regard he now bears a proportione of the tax roll, as being a heritor of ane burgh of barronie, and that he has assisted the royall burrowes severall tymes for makeing the proportione laid on the burghs of baronies and regalities effectwall, as has been publiclye acknowledged by Mr. John Buchan, their agent and tacksman," therefore, and for certain other considerations, the convention "allowed the said Sir John Shaw to be present at this and any other meeting of the royall burrowes heirafter, and there to give informatione and advyce anent the trade of the burghs, as well royall as others; as also they recommend to Mr. John Buchan, their tacksman, to deal discreetly and favourably with Sir John anent his proportion of the tax roll; and farder recommends to the members of the comity that ar to sitt at Edinburgh to endeavour ane accommodatione betuixt the town of Glasgow and Sir John."⁵ It appears from an act of convention, dated 19th November, 1697, that Sir John had lent Mr. Buchan 10,000 merks (£555 11s. 1d. sterling), to aid him in carrying out certain arrangements with the convention, and that it became bound as cautioner for that sum.⁶ It may

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 139-141.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 157-8. (12th July, 1692.)

² See act of convention, 12th July, 1692,

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 177..

reciting petition of Sir John Shaw

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

(Convention Records, IV., pp. 155-8).

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 254. This obligation appears to have been discharged on 9th July, 1700 (Convention Records, IV., p. 304).

On 15th September, 1692, Glasgow resolved to pursue the laird of Greenock before what judicatory should, by the advice of lawyers, be thought most fitting, for the riot and abuse

be presumed, therefore, that Sir John's relations with both the convention and Buchan were of the most amiable nature, and that these relations extended to Greenock.

On 10th July, 1691, the provost of Glasgow, on behalf of the burgh, petitioned the convention for authority to sell their lands of Provan and such other lands or feu-duties as belonged to the burgh, and to employ the price towards the payment of debt. This petition set forth that, whereas the town had at one time "flowrished in its trade and inhabitants," and paid a large share of public burdens, it had of late "become altogether incapable of subsistance, in regard of these heavie burdens that lye therupon, occasioned by the vast soumes that have bein borrowed by the late magistrats, and the misapplying and dilapidation of the touns patrimony in suffering ther debts to swell and employing the comon stock for ther oun sinistruous ends and uses." It therefore became necessary to sell a great part of the burghal patrimony. After consideration, the convention authorised the sale, the proceeds to be employed in paying the debts of the burgh.¹

The inquiry as to the condition of several of the royal burghs ordered by the convention in July, 1688, was probably not made prior to the meeting of that body on 15th July, 1689, when instructions were given as to the number and quorum of the commissioners who were to examine and report as to Glasgow, Rutherglen, and Irvine, and also as to Ayr, Inverness, and Peebles. Commissioners were also appointed to make similar enquiries in other burghs.² The impoverished condition of many of the burghs at this time and the frequent representations made by them as to their inability to pay their respective contributions to the tax which the convention imposed, rendered a general inquiry necessary, but the difficulties of the times, occasioned by war and other troubles, were assigned by several of the burghs for not reporting as to their "particular conditions."³ On 14th July, 1690, the convention empowered Edinburgh and other eleven burghs, five to be a quorum, to appoint visitations through the whole royal burghs, to try, as regarded each, its condition, trade, and common good, and to give such instructions to the visitors as they thought proper.⁴

On 19th November the committee of convention, appointed on 14th July, 1690, ordered a letter to be sent to each of the burghs of barony and regality intimating that, if it was prepared to make such satisfying proposals as might incline the committee to accept them, its representative would be fully heard. Schedules of information as to the condition of all the royal burghs, and also of

done by him in imprisoning some persons employed by Glasgow to put a door in the house in Greenock which belonged formerly to the fishing society, but now to Glasgow, and for impeding the city in putting out the door and planting trees and fixing them to the wall of the city's close there (Glasgow Records, IV., p. 52).

¹ Convention Records, IV., p. 136.

³ *Ibid.*, IV., p. 114.

² *Ibid.*, IV., p. 92.

⁴ *Ibid.*, IV., p. 119.

the burghs of regality and barony, were also prepared, and two members of committee were appointed to visit the burghs besouth Forth, and two benorth Forth.¹

The orders given by the convention in July, 1690, for the visitation of the royal burghs specified, and the submission to it of the reports of the visitors, had not been carried into effect, and on 9th July, 1691, the convention ordered every royal burgh to be visited and reported on, in conformity with the revised and amended instructions then approved of.² This enlarged inquiry was intended also to afford the necessary means of readjusting the tax roll of the burghs. Under these instructions the reports of the visitors to the several burghs were reported to the convention on 14th July, 1692, and formed the basis on which the tax roll was prepared.³ By it the proportion per £100⁴ of Glasgow was fixed at £15 and Edinburgh at £32 6s. 8d., while Aberdeen was £6 1s.; Dundee, £4 13s. 4d.; Perth, £3; Stirling, £1 8s. 8d.; and Linlithgow, £1 6s. The proportions of the burghs on the Clyde, other than Glasgow, were Rutherglen, 2s.; Dumbarton, 5s.; Irvine, 10s.; Rothesay, 5s.; and Renfrew, 6s.⁵ The reports of the visitors are printed in the Records of the Convention of Royal Burghs, and in the Miscellany of the Scottish Burgh Records Society, pp. 53-157, and furnish authoritative information as to the condition of the several royal and free burghs in 1691-2 as regards trade and shipping.

The reports on the burghs connected with the Clyde—viz., Rutherglen, Glasgow, Renfrew, Dumbarton, Rothesay, and Irvine—are instructive.

By the instructions given to the visitors they were required—

- (Article 1) To take an exact account of the common good and debt certified by the magistrates and town clerk.
- (6) To take exact trial in all burghs of their trade, both foreign and inland, and particularly of the wines and of the vent [sale] and consumption of malt for five years backward.
- (7) To take exact account of what ships, barks, boats, and ferry boats they have belonging to them, the names of these ships, their burden, the value of each, and how employed and by whom.
- (8) To take an account of what ships they were owners or part owners, both within and without their own burghs, and how far they are concerned with the burghs of regalities and baronies in the matter of trade.
- (11) To take exact notice how their publick works are maintained, and out of what funds, such as churches, hospitals, bridges, harbours, and the lyk.
- (12) To take exact inspection of the caice of the houses of the toune and how they are inhabited, and what rents they may be of, and of what rent houses inhabited by strangers are.

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 123-7.

³ *Ibid.*, IV., pp. 160-1.

² *Ibid.*, IV., pp. 129-131.

⁴ Only £90 was laid on the royal burghs. The remaining £10 was to be borne by John Buchan, who expected to be recouped by the contributions of those unfree burghs which acquired trading privileges (*Infra*, p. 139).

⁵ *Ibid.*, IV., p. 161.

- (13) To take an exact accompt how many fairs and publict markets each burgh has yearly, and of how long endurance, and what the intrinsic value or importance the same may be.
- (14) To take information from the magistrates of the royal burghs of the state and condition of the regalities, baronies, and other unfree burghs within their respective precincts, as to their trade, common good, and condition of their houses and inhabitants of the unfree burghs.¹

In reply to these articles the visitors reported—

AS REGARDED RUTHERGLEN.

(1) That their comon good, *communibus annis*, extends to 959 lib. 16s. 3d. Scots, and that their debt extends to the sowme of 7,100 marks.

(6) That they have neither forraigne trade nor inland trade, and that they vent nor consume noe French wine, seck or brandie, except some few pints of brandie they buy from Glasgow, and that they consume about fyve bolls of malt weekly or thereby.

(7) That they have no ships, barks, boats, or ferrie boats belonging to them.

(8) That they are not owners nor partners of any shipes, barks or boats belonging either to burghs royale, of regalitie or barronie, nor are they concerned in matter of trade with unfree burghs.

(11) That all ther publict works are maintained and supported out of the comon good.

(12) That the most pairt of ther houses are inhabited by ther respective heretors, and that the rent of the best and worst of there houses will be tuixt eight pounds to four lib. Scots, and that they have no stranger inhabitants.

(13) That they have four yearly fairs, three of one dayes containwance and the fourth of four or fyve days, the customs of all which are reckoned as a pairt of ther comon good and soe stated in answer to the first article, and that they have no weekly marcat.

(14) That they have no unfree burghs within ther precincts prejudicial to ther trade.²

AS REGARDED GLASGOW.

(1) That their comon good will amount, *communibus annis*, to the sowme of sextene thousand nine hundred and two pounds Scots . . . and that ther debts extends to ane hundredreth and seaventy eight thousand eight hundredreth pounds Scots principal and annual rents.

(6) That ther forraigne trade of export and import, according to the exactest calculatione they can make, amounts yeirly to the value of two hundred and fyve thousand pounds Scots monic or thereby, and that they cannot condescend upon any retailling inland trade they have by [besides] ther ships, the most pairt thereof being included in the export and import as aforesaid; and that they vent and retail about twenty tunns of French wine, twenty butts of seck, and about ten or twelve butts of brandy or thereby yearly; but the consumption of their wines is still less or more according to ther price is high or low, and that they vent and consume about a thousand bolls of malt monethely.

(7) That they have fyfteen ships, whereof there are eight lyeing in ther harbour³ and seaven⁴

¹ Convention Records, IV., 563-4. Mis-cellany, pp. 53-4. ² Convention Records, IV., 650-1. Mis-cellany, pp. 140-1.

³ These eight vessels represented a tonnage of 730 tons, or an average of 91 tons, and a total value of £33,333 6s. 8d. Scots (£2,777 15s. 6d. sterling), or an average of £4,166 13s. 3d. Scots (£347 4s. 5d. sterling) [Convention Records, IV., p. 584].

⁴ These seven vessels represented a total tonnage of 452 tons, or an average of 65 tons, and a total value of £13,200 Scots (£1,100 sterling), or an average of £1,885 11s. 5d. Scots (£157 2s. 7d. sterling) [*Ibid.*, IV., p. 585].

abroad, and eight lighters¹ whose burden, value, how and by whom employed, is at length contained in a paper apart given by the magistrates to the visitors, and have no other ships, barks, boats or ferrie boats belonging to them.

(8) That they are owners and partners of four ships belonging to unfree burghs, whose burden, value, how employed, is at length contained in the above mentioned paper, and their trade with unfree burghs is condescended upon in the same.

(11) That all ther publict works are supported and maintained out of the common good.

(12) That by the decay of trade a great number and many of the best of ther houses are waste, yea that ther is near fyve hundredth houses standing waste, and that those inhabited are fallen near a third pairt of the rent they payed formerly, and that ther best and worst will be betwixt ane hundredth pounds (whereof they have not eight inhabited by burgers) and four pounds Scots yearly, except some large taverns.

(13) That they have one yearly fair of fyve or six days containwance, and three yearly marcats each of one dayes containwance, and a weekly marcat, and that the town hath no benefit by them.

(14) That they have the burghs of regality and barronic following, viz.: — Hamiltoun, a considerable distance from the sea, and soe hath no forraigne trade, but a great inland, and most pairt thereof from Borrowstounness, and is in a flourishing condition; item, Paisly hes a great inland trade, and is in a very flourishing condition; item, Greenock hes a very great trade, both forraigne and inland, and particularlie prejudicial to the trade of Glasgow and other places on the river of Clyde by buying portage from skippers and sailors to the value of the tenth pairt of the loadening, and for better effectuating thereof they stock the samen out with comodities and goes half profit with them; item, Craufurdsdyk, belonging to Craufurd of Craufurdsburne and his sone, two burgers and inhabitants of Glasgow—it hath same trade in furnishing seamen with meat and drink, and that all these burghs are highly prejudicall to ther trade.

There ar lyckwayes some houses and saillarics [cellars] at Port-Glasgow,² but by reason of the great decay of trade ther is nothing gott for them, yea not soe much as it cost the toun in upholding them. The forsaide expence is by and attour the many annualrents they are obligeid to pay yearly for the vast sowmes they are indew, as lyckwayes over and above their cesses and missive dewes of the burrowes, as also the support of the government; all which, with the contingent charges of pleyes and debats of law, amounts to a very great expence, under which this poor place cannot subsist.³

AS REGARDED RENFREW.

(1) That there common good, *comunibus annis*, amounts to the sum of 581 lib. 14s. Scots, and that ther debt amounts to 6,784 lib. 13s. 4d.

(6) That they have no forraigne trade, ther being no persons of any stock amongst them, and that there inland trade is not worth the nameyng, not having one merchants shop within

¹ The eight lighters belonging to the town, keepeid for the most pairt by the merchants for ther own use and carieing coalls, wherof otherways they have no profit.

² As to trade with unfreemen or unfree burghs there is ordinarily bought of the herrings exported by the merchants of Glasgow above two hunder lasts from Greenock men; as also the far greatest pairt of Hollands comodities brought to this town from skippers, seamen, and others living at Borrowstounness and other places upon that coast.

³ Convention Records, IV., 581-5. Miscellany, pp. 71-5.

On 15th September, 1692, the town treasurer of Glasgow was ordered to have a warrant for the sum of four guineas payed by him to the two clerks who accompanied the two commissioners appointed by the royal burghs to take an account of the state and condition of the burghs (Glasgow Records, IV., p. 50).

136 FROM THE ACCESSION OF KING JAMES VII.

ther burgh; all they have consists of some green herring they bring from the lochs to Glasgow for serveing the countrey, and that they vent nor retaill no wine nor seek within the burgh, and what brandie they vent they bring it from Glasgow in gallons and half gallons, and that the consumption of ther malt will be about four bolls weekly.

(7) That they have no ships nor barks, but twenty-four boats of burthen betwixt three and fyve tunns, employed for carieing herring from the forsaids lochs, about one hundredth marks the piece of value one with another, and two other boats of a greater seize, employed for making of salt herring, from 12 to 15 tunns of burthen, and about four hundredth marks the piece of value one with another.

(8) That they are neither owners nor partners of any ships, barks or boats belonging to burghs royal, or regalitie or barronie, nor are they concerned in matter of trade with unfree burghs royal, or regalitie or barronie, nor are they concerned in matter of trade with unfree burghs.

(11) That all their publict works are supported out of the common good.

(12) That most of ther houses are inhabited by ther respective heretores, and the rents of the rest will be 'twixt twenty marks and fourtie shillings Scots, the best and worst, and that they have no stranger inhabitants.

(13) That they have two yearly fairs, albeit their gift gives them right to a third, the customes whereof are a part of ther comon good, and so stated in answer to the first article, and that they have no weekly marcat.

(14) That they have within ther precinct the particular burghs of barronie and regality after specifeit, viz., Paisley, Kilbarchan, Houstone, Kilmacrom, Newark, Carsedyck, Greenock, Innerkeip, and Gourack, all which are in a flourishing condicione and have a considerable retail, and that the worst of these have a much more considerable trade than themselves.¹

AS REGARDED DUMBARTON.

(1) That ther common good, *communibus annis*, amounts to £1,343 6s. 8d., besides the sowme of £130 of small customs yearly for maintaining of ther water works, and that ther debts dew be bond consists of 9,000 marks Scots monie of principall.

(6) That they have no forraine trade, and all there inland trade consists of some small goodes they retaill from Glasgow and other royll burghs of ane inconsiderable value, and that they have vented fyve years bygone about ane hoghshead and ane half of French wynes and a hoghshead of brandie, and that they vent and consume weekly about four bolls of malt or therby.

(7) That they have no ships, barks or boats belonging to them, except a little small bark of twenty four tunns about the value of ane thousand marks, and is employed by Glasgow merchants and other strangers, and three small herring boates ane hundredth marks value one with another.

(8) That they are neither owners nor partners of any shipes, barks or boats belonging either to burghs royall, of regality or barronie, nor are they concerned in trade with unfrie burghs.

(11) That all ther publict workes are maintained and upholden out of the common good.

(12) That the most pairt of ther houses are inhabited by ther respective heritors, and the rent of ther best and warst will be twixt fourty pounds and four marks, and that they have no stranger inhabitants, and that a great pairt and many of ther best houses are waste.

(13) That they have two yearly fairs, each of two days containwance, and a weekly marcat, the customes of all which are a pairt of ther comon good, and accordingly stated in answer to ther first article.

(14) That they have two regalities, Kilpatrick and Kilmarnock, and two barronies, Kirkintulloch and Cambernald, which burghs are highly prejudicial to ther trade.²

¹ Convention Records, IV., 628-9. Mis-
cellany, pp. 118-20.

² Convention Records, IV., 626-8. Mis-
cellany, pp. 116-8.

AS REGARDED ROTHESAY.

(1) That the common good of the burgh, *communibus annis*, amounted to £159 13s. 4d., and its debt to £213.

(6) That they had no treasurer's books to produce; that their equies extended, with clerks and other dues, to £17 14s.; that they had no foreign or inland trade except some goods of inconsiderable value, which they retailed from Glasgow; that they had vented no seek, wine, or brandy for the previous five years, save two hogshead of wine, and about eight gallons of seek or thereby; and that they could give no account of what quantity of malt they consumed yearly.

(7) That they had no ships or barks, but only one small boat of 12 tuns burden and of the value of about £12 sterling, and 19 herring boats of the value of about £80.

(8) That they were neither owners nor partners of any ships, barks, or boats belonging either to royal burghs or burghs of barony or regality; and that they were not concerned with any unfree burgh in matter of trade.

(11) That the church and all other public works were maintained out of the common good.

(12) That the houses were possessed by their respective heritors, except a few inhabited by tenants; that the best and worst would be between £16 and £4 Scots; and that there were no stranger inhabitants.

(13) That the burgh had two yearly fairs, the one of one day's and the other of two days' continuance; and the customs thereof were part of the common good.

(14) That no burghs of barony or regality were within the precincts of Rothesay.

It was noted that there was £77 of more debt owing by the burgh than was stated in the first article.¹

AS REGARDED IRVINE.

(1) That there comon good, *communibus annis*, will extend to the sowme of 1,791 lib. 18s. Scots, and that ther debts will amount to 11,636 lib. 0s. 5d., whereof there is 4,133 lib. 13s. 4d. in dependance before the parliament, being for the plack on the point in King James tyme.

(6) That these fyve preceding years all the forraigne trade they have had is the particulars followeing, viz.:—ane ship of 70 tunn burden from Fraunce, loadened with salt and brandie; item, another small veshell from France, loadened with salt and brandie; item, another small veshell from Norway, loadened with tarr and daills, of burden about 30 tunns; and that they have exported about thirtie pack of wool or thereby yeirly for these two years bygone, each of which packs weighs about twelve stone; also about seaven or eight small barks, about 20 tunn the piece, loadened with victwall, the beginning of the Irish troubles, anno 1689 and 1690, wherein there were some strangers concerned, and a fourth pairt of ane small veshell from Norway; there pairt of the loadening thereof came to 600 daills; and ane other ship from France, of 70 tunns, loadened with salt, and a small little brandie. And that ther inland trade is verie inconsiderable, and what they have is by retaill of some brought from Glasgow and other royal burghs, and that they have vented about a tunn of wine, seek, and brandie, each year, these fyve years bygone; and that they will consume about fourty bolls of malt, Lithgow measure, weekly, and that they hade a small quantity, about twelve daares, imported by strangers.

(7) That they hadde eight small ships, barks and boats belonging to them, whose burden, value and how employed is conform to ane particular accompt in answer to this article given in under ther hands to the saids visitors, of which eight ships they have latly lost one.

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 648 9. Miscellany, pp. 138-9.

(8) That they are concerned in matters of shipping in soe far it is mentioned in the above-mentioned article, and that they are no other wayes concerned with unfrie traders in matter of trade.

(11) That all ther publict works are maintaint out of ther common good.

(12) That those houses where the heretors themselves doe stay are not stented, and the remainder posest be tenants pays monethly thrie pennies on each mark piece of rent by a stranger and two pennies by a freeman, and the rent of ther haill sett houses extends to 1,621 lib. 13s. 4d., but of these there are a great many waist, and that ther borrow aikers payes two pennies on each mark rent without any rebatment.

(13) That they have ane yearly fair, which begins the 8th and endest the 13th of August, whereof the Earls of Eglintowne are keepers, by ther deputs, fiscals, and tenents, and have the one half of the customes; and they have two weekly marcats or fair dayes, and that the customes of the same are a pairt of their comon good, and soe stated in answer to the first article, and that ther are no other fairs in use to be held at the said burgh, albeit by ther charter they have right to another, which is no wont of use to be keepe.

(14) That the burghs of baronies and regalities lyeing within their precinct are as follows, viz., ane burgh of regality, Kilwinning, and of baronies, Kilmarnock, Kilmaurs, Newmilns, Stewartoun, Beeth and Largs, which are very prejudiciale to them in point of trade, and serve the most pairt of the countrey with goods by retaill, and that ther houses are better and more of them than many royll burghs, particularly Kilmarnock, which hath a comon good and keeps a mercat.¹

On 5th September, 1691, the town council of Glasgow resolved to let by roup its great lodging at Newport, with the office houses, close and cellars, yard and park, and benefit of the harbour, and all interest which Glasgow had there, except the lodging in which the collector dwelt and the custom house, with the smithy and north-west corner house next to the quay for a blockmaker to live in. The persons to whom the subjects were to be rouped required to be burgesses and inhabitants of Glasgow, who had to reside in the lodging and to give effect to a variety of conditions. Every ship and boat belonging to burgesses and inhabitants coming within the harbour of Newport had to pay specified dues, to be applied in completing the Newport harbour.² It was also resolved that the old fishing close in Greenock should be set or sold for payment of fifty marks of tack duty yearly, the first offer being made to the laird of Greenock.³

On 13th July, 1692, the convention of burghs entered into an arrangement with John Buchan, advocate, its agent, under which he undertook to relieve the burghs of ten per cent. of the King's cess and missive dues for three years after the following Lammas, the convention granting him "the sole and universal power" which the royal burghs had in executing the act of parliament 1690, c. 15, and the act of convention of 10th July, 1691,⁴ made against freemen of burghs trading

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 612-4. Miscellany, pp. 102-4.

Camden, in his "Description of Scotland" (2nd Edit., Edinburgh, 1695, p. 68, chap. xiv.), says—"At the mouth of this river standeth Irvine, with a haven so barked up with shelves of sand, and so shallow withall, that it can bear none other vessels but small barks and boats."

² Glasgow Records, IV., p. 34.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Convention Records, IV., pp. 133-4. *Antea*, pp. 127-30.

with unfreemen either in merchandise or shipping, with power to him and his substitute, for whom he should be answerable, to put these acts to full and final execution through all the royal burghs, and against unfree traders, and generally with power to Buchan to communicate the benefit of trade during these three years to regalities, baronies and such other unfree places as he thought fit, and to do everything in relation to these acts which the royal burghs could do. He was empowered to apply all the fines, penalties and casualties coming under this arrangement to his own use for the period of three years, or two years longer if he thought fit. It was, however, provided that the royal burghs might, on the application of burghs of barony and regality and other unfree places, receive and admit them to the privilege of trade on such compositions as the royal burghs might think fit, but the benefit of these compositions should be paid to Buchan.¹

On 14th June, 1693, an act of parliament was passed which, after narrating the arrangement entered into by the convention with Buchan, its agent, on 13th July, 1692, for the communication of trade to burghs of regality, barony, and others, approved and confirmed it, and ordained similar execution to pass against these burghs for inbringing the proportions of the burden to be paid by them for relief of the royal burghs, which any of them had already or should thereafter agree to. It was further ordained that, after the expiry of the contract with Buchan, the communication of trade should continue to these burghs so long as they paid the royal burghs a just proportion of the £100 of the tax roll, as determined by the convention or by parliament on the application of the burghs of regality and barony. All persons were prohibited from exercising any kind of trade under prescribed penalties, save burgesses and dwellers in royal burghs and their free ports, with consent of the burghs to which they belong, and those of burghs of regality and others foresaid. All who had the benefit of the communication of trade were, moreover, empowered to put all acts of parliament in favour of royal burghs in full execution against such unfree traders within their bounds as did not pay a proportion of the quota of which the royal burghs were relieved, and to apply the fines and penalties to their own use. The masters or magistrates of the towns to which trade was communicated were also authorised to appoint stent masters within these towns for apportioning the burden on the traders and others who had benefit by the trade.² Protestation was made by the commissioner for Glasgow that this act should not prejudice his burgh, and similar protestation was made for the merchants of Edinburgh and Stirling.³

On 13th December, 1692, an obligation was undertaken by the merchants of Glasgow not to load or unload vessels at any port or creek on the Clyde except at Newport. This obligation proceeds on the narrative that, for the behoof and advantage of the royal burghs and the prevention of fraud in the levying

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 159-60.

³ *Ibid.*, App., p. 90.

² 1693, c. 51, Acts of Parliament, IX., p. 315-6.

of the royal revenues, all ships and other vessels coming to or going from the realm should load and unload their goods at royal burghs, and that the sale and merchandise of such goods should belong exclusively to the burgesses of royal burghs; that specially considering that Glasgow had of late years expended great sums of money in purchasing ground for, and had constructed a safe and convenient harbour at, Port-Glasgow, with lodgings, cellars, and other buildings for loading, livering, preserving, and bestowing all manner of goods accustomed to be imported or exported, with fit and convenient habitations for seamen, carpenters, and others necessary to such livering and loading, and for building, dressing, and repairing of vessels, and for the King's custom office, with the servants and dependents thereto belonging, and for the public advantages therein specified. It then set forth that the magistrates and council of Glasgow, with consent of the dean of guild and his council, and the deacon-convener, deacons, and other members of the trades, had agreed to pass by the punishment of previous contraventions of the laws, occasioned by the late troubles, on condition that all the merchants, freemen, and guild brethren of the burgh using merchandise should observe the following article and condition, viz.:—That no one should load or unload any ship or vessel, or build, dress, or repair it at any port or creek on the Clyde, except at Newport-Glasgow, and, in case of necessity, at the ports of other royal burghs on the river. This obligation bears to have adhibited to it the signatures of eighty-nine persons using merchandise in the burgh.¹

On 15th June, 1693, an act of parliament was passed granting to Glasgow authority to levy, for such numbers of years as their magistrates might appoint, not exceeding thirteen years, an imposition of two pennies Scots on every pint of ale and beer brewed or inbrought and sold within the town, its suburbs and liberties. This impost bears to have been granted in consideration of the great debts and burdens upon the town, occasioned by the malversation of the former magistrates, which threatened to bring that once flourishing place to utter ruin.² King William, by a letter from the camp at Lembeck to the privy council, dated 14th, and registered in the books of the privy council, 29th August, O.S., 1693, ordered this impost to endure for thirteen years.³

¹ Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 243-6, No. 162.

1693, c. 66. Acts of Parliament, IX., p. 328. Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 246 9.

This statement of the condition of Glasgow was probably somewhat exaggerated to support its object. Considered, however, in connection with the position of the city relatively to that of the other burghs of Scotland at the time, and its great advance during the preceding 150 years, a universal depression seemed to have prevailed in which the city had suffered less than other burghs.

² Glasgow Charters, No. 164. This impost was, on 21st September, 1705, continued for sixteen years from the termination of the former grant [1705, c. 54, Acts of Parliament, XI., p. 297. Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 290-3, No. 173], and by successive acts was subsequently continued till 1837.

In 1694 Sir John Shaw was one of the tacksmen of customs, and on a private application obtained permission to remove the custom house from Port-Glasgow to Greenock. Against this action Glasgow appealed to the lords of the treasury and exchequer on 2nd March, 1694, and obtained an order to have the custom house brought back to Port-Glasgow. It seems, however, that Sir John had not given prompt effect to this order, for on the 7th, 8th, and 10th days of March, instruments were taken against both the tacksman and collector of customs requiring them to give obedience to the order.¹

On 8th September, 1694, application was made to the presbytery of Paisley to disjoin the lands of Newark from the parish of Kilmalcolm, and to erect them into a separate parish, under the name of Port-Glasgow. The granting of this application was, however, delayed, in consequence of a claim by the earl of Glencairn to the patronage.² Decree of disjunction and erection was pronounced on 1st July, 1696.³ The sum of 600 merks was, in 1717, paid to the earl of Glencairn for renunciation of the patronage.⁴

On 25th September, 1693, the town council of Glasgow referring (1) to the various acts of parliament requiring the ships of natives or strangers coming to Scotland to discharge their goods and merchandise at royal burghs or free ports belonging to such burghs, and (2) to the repeated acts of the convention of burghs prohibiting, under severe penalties, all burgesses of royal burghs from packing

¹ Glasgow Charters, II., p. 410; Glasgow Records, pp. 112, 115, 118; Historical MSS. Commissioners' Report (Earl of Mar, 1904), p. 398.

At an earlier date the collector of customs appears to have had his headquarters at Glasgow. Accounts (1) "of guidis and merchanders transportit furchte off Clyd and entered at Glasgow," and (2) "of the guidis introcht into the river of Clyd," from 1st November, 1626, to 1st November, 1627, are printed in Glasgow Charters (II., pp. 580-7). During that year there are sixteen entries of vessels with exports, viz., four from Glasgow, three from Greenock, six from Renfrew, one from Kilpatrick, one from Gourock, and one from a port not named. The exports consisted of coals, linen and other cloth, salt and herrings to Ireland (six sailings), herrings to England (one sailing), and the same commodities, besides dry fish, pots, iron, sugar and other wares to places not named. In the account of imports are thirty-one entries of vessels, ten of these being specifically connected with Renfrew, four with Glasgow, two with Gourock, one with Greenock, and another with Dumbarton. France (including Rochelle), Holland, England, and Ireland are named as places from which some of the vessels sailed. From France came salt; from Holland, deals; from England, soap; from Ireland, salt and tanned hides, salmon, beef, staves, and iron; and from places not named salt, salt hides, beef, barrel staves, deals, tanned hides, "rims" and sheep skins. The custom on the exports amounted to £189 18s. and on imports to £613 19s. Scots. The traffic in merchandise, chiefly linen cloth and yarn, "outward be land till Ingland" brought in £1,748 Scots, and the traffic "inward from Ingland," chiefly in Manchester ware and hard ware, £141 13s. 4d. Scots of custom. Total for shipping and land traffic, £2,693 10s. 4d. Scots = £224 9s. 2d. sterling (*Ibid.*, pp. 587-91).

² Glasgow Records, IV., pp. 127, 133, 206-9, 216.

³ Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 264-6.

⁴ Glasgow Records, IV., p. 608.

or peiling, or being partners with unfreemen, not burgesses of royal burghs, either in point of trade or shipping, or from loading or unloading their ships or vessels at any other ports than those belonging to free royal burghs; and seeing that Glasgow had been at great expense in building a harbour, lodging-houses, cellars, lofts and other conveniences at Port-Glasgow, and had erected the same into a free royal port for the accommodation of shipping and merchandise, and for encouraging the trade of these burgesses and strangers who might resort thereto; as also considering that the merchants and other trading men of Glasgow judged it most fit and conducive to the benefit of trade that all ships and vessels freighted by or belonging to the freemen burgesses of the city should liver and load their goods and merchandise and dress their vessels at the port of Port-Glasgow, and had subscribed an obligation to that effect at Glasgow on 13th December, 1692, yet notwithstanding the repealed acts of parliament and conventions and of the town council of Glasgow, and the obligation above referred to, several burgesses of the city had livered and loaded, dressed their ships, and cellared their goods at places on the Clyde other than Port-Glasgow, or other free royal burghs, to the prejudice of the burgh, they (the magistrates and town council) therefore prohibited all their inhabitants, burgesses and traders, from livering, loading and cellaring their goods at any port within the Clyde, save Port-Glasgow, Dumbarton, or Renfrew, under the pain of 500 merks, *toties quoties*, to be paid by the contraveners for the use of the common good of the city, over and above what further punishment the magistrates and council should think fit to inflict.¹

On 9th March, 1695, the town council of Glasgow appointed Francis Stevenson, wright, to go to Port-Glasgow and repair the custom-house and powder-house in the town's garden there, to hear and settle all differences between the feuars, and mark out the ground for persons desiring to feu.² On 6th April the town council appointed the dean of guild and deacon convener to proceed to Port-Glasgow, and endeavour to induce the bailie there to retain his office; and also to require the buildings to be made regular and sufficient.³ On 2nd December the merchants and crafts of Glasgow, having been consulted by the town council, according to custom, as to the dues to be paid by all ships, boats and other vessels repairing to the road and harbour of Port-Glasgow, and quay at the Broomielaw, and also as to the rules and laws to be observed there, passed an act prescribing the following dues and regulations:—⁴

DEWS to be payed be all ships, barks, boats and other veshells, repairing to the road and harbour at Portglasgow.

Imprimis, all ships att or above ane hundredth tuns burden, belonging to burgesses and freemen of and within the town of Glasgow, shall pay of anchorage four pounds Scots, and strangers and unfreemen the double.

¹ Glasgow Records, IV., pp. 85-6.

² *Ibid.*, IV., p. 153.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 182-7.

Item, all ships, barks and other veshells that are under ane hundredth tuns and above threttie tuns, belonging to freemen, burgesses as said is, shall pay two pounds Scots, and strangers and unfreemen the double.

Item, all ships, barks and other veshells of threttie tunns and not under twelve tunns, belonging to freemen, burgesses as said is, shall pay two merks, and strangers the double.

Item, all gabarts and boats that comes within the harbour, or makes fast upon the key, or shelters within the bay, or livers or loads in the road, belonging to freemen burgesses as said is, each shall pay three shilling Scots, and all strangers and unfreemen the double.¹

Item, that all yeolls and small boats for passengers, touching at the outsyde of the key, for the putting out of or takeing in any goods belonging to freemen, each shall pay twelve pounds Scots, and if they come within the key or bay of Newark two shilling moncy forsaid, and that strangers pay the double.

RULES and LAWES to be observed for the harbour and key att Portglasgow.

Imprimis, that no ships, barks or boats are to cast out any ballast or dirt within the harbour, or to liver or loaden ballast within the said harbour or road, but in the day time, without libertie granted be the baillie there, and that they take it in att their ballast port or their hatches, they alwayes haveing a cloath spread betwixt the ship and the said ballast boat that none of the ballast fall in the harbour or road.

Item, that no stone ballast, or any other ballast whatsomever, be laid upon the shoare, within the bounds of the harbour or bay of Newark, butt be carried a convenient distance to the northwest, att the back of the harbour, and there be laid as near the shoare as the boat can float to att the full sea, and that att the sight and appointment of the baillie.

Item, if any person design to putt out any stone ballast out of their ship with a resolution to take it on board again as their convenience will serve them, they are not to put it out untill first they obtain libertie from the baillie, who is to appoint a place where it is to be laid, and in caise the said person take it not aboard again as wes resolved, the baillie is ordered to cause him take it aboard or to carry it to the northwest pairt of the back of the key, att a considerable distance as the baillie shall appoint, which if he refuse the baillie is to arrest his ship ay and whill he find caution or consign moncy in the baillies hand for that effect, and in caise of not speedie complyance that the baillie fyne him for his contumacie.

Item, that none cast out anchors in the harbour or road without bowies on them, under the pain of twentie pounds Scots attour satisfieing the dammages.

Item, whatever veshell comes first in the harbour or lies in the insyde nearest to the key or breastwork, they are to fenn off themselves from the key or breastwork, and all last comers are to fenn of them, and everyone is to fenn off the insyde ship.

Item, that no goods of whatsoever quality be laid on the key or breastwork or any other place, without libertie asked and given by the baillie, who is to appoint the particular place where they are to be laid for preventing of disorder and confusion.

¹ There having lately come to the port vessels belonging to Ireland "which in that kingdome are under the name of gabarts, which ought reallie rather to be comprehended under the names of ships and barks," the town council, on 20th February, 1697, declared that the dnties of 3s. and 6s. were only for gabarts belonging to the river, and appointed the dues for all other vessels to be according to the burdens thereof; and gabarts, even belonging to the river, going beyond or coming from without "the Comracheads" to be similarly charged (Glasgow Records, IV., pp. 231-2).

144 FROM THE ACCESSION OF KING JAMES VII.

Item, if any veshell be laid to for livering and loading upon the shoare, key or breastwork, and doe not use diligence and expedition for the doing of the same, but delay to the prejudice of other veshells to come in to their berth for livering and loading as said is, they shall be appointed to remove and give place to the other, att the discretion of the baillie.

Item, if their be att one tyme severall veshells livering or loading, and not sufficient lighters or boats to serve them all, the boats are to be divyded equally at the discretion of the baillie, notwithstanding of any paction or agreement made by aither of the pairties.

Item, whosoever has occasion to break ground upon the graveing bank or elsewhere in the bay, they are to fill it up sufficiently att the sight of the baillie, under the pain of fyve pounds.

Item, that no person whatsoeuer lay down any dirt or red of their housses, or anything whatsoeuer that may be hurtfull and prejudiciale any manner of way to the harbour, or the passage on the high streets, and if they doe they shall be oblidged furthwith to carry it off, under the pain of fyve pounds attour performance.

Item, that what sunk boats are presently within the harbour shall be lifted up and carried to a convenient place without the harbour, at the sight of the baillie, and that in tyme comeing no disabled and sunk ship, bark or boat shall ly within the harbour longer than eight weeks, and that in order to repairing and dresseing, and eftir that tyme is expired the owners therof shall be oblidged to carry them out of the said harbour to such convenient places as the baillie shall appoint; and in caise the owners of the saids veshells or boats already sunk, or that shall be heireftir disabled and sunk as said is, shall delay eftir the said tyme appointed, the baillie shall require them to carry them furth of the said harbour and lay them in such convenient places of the bay as he shall think fitt, and in caise of refuseall or not present complyance with the said appointment the baillie is heirby authorized to carry the saids veshells furth, upon the expensisse of the owners, and lay them in such convenient places as he shall think expedient without his being lyable for the dannages to be sustained therby, off which the baillie is heirby declared quyt and free.

Dews to be payed for the conveinience of the key att the Broomielaw, for the building and mentainance therof, and that by and attour what old dews are payed for the bridge.

Imprimis, that all gabarts or boats livering and loading at the key, or any paire in the river of Clyd att or betwixt Kelvin Pott, att or above twelve tuns burden, shall pay for the causses forsaide, every freeman burges inhabitant of this town four shilling, and strangers and unfreemen the double.

Item, all boats or gabarts below twleve tuns, and att or above sex tuns, belonging to freemen burgesses as said is shall pay three shilling, and strangers sex shilling Scots money.

Item, all boats under sex tuns, and att or above two tuns burden, belonging to freemen burgesses as said is shall pay ane shilling sex pennies, and strangers the double.

Item, all boats below two tuns, belonging to freemen burgesses as said is, shall pay ane shilling, and strangers the double.

Item, all goods of whatsoever quality, livered and loaded at the key of the Broomielaw, each freemen burges as said is shall pay eight pennies per tun, and strangers or unfreemen ane shilling four pennies, reckoning for the tun four Burdeaux hoggsheads, eight barrells, two thousand weight, ane hundredth daills, eight thousand herring in bulk, and what other goods is not distinguished here by the tun is to pay according to the burden of the boat.

Item, all provisions for ships that are loaded at the Broomielaw are to be free. As for

the towns of Renfrew, Dumbartane and Rutherglen, they are only to pay as freemen burgesses of Glasgow.¹

RULES and LAWES to be observed at the key of the Broomielaw.

Imprimis, whatsoever boats comes to liver at the key, all empty boats is to give way to them that they may liver their goods with ease.

Item, all boats that are to take in any goods att the key, empty boats that are not presently to loaden are to give way to them.

Item, no boats lying att the key are to lay out their anchors theron but to make fast by the rings.

Item, no anehore is to be laid in the water except their be ane bowie theron, under the penalty of a rex dollar by and attour paying the dammage.

Item, that no ballast stones be laid on the key without libertie from the water baillie, under the penalty of ane rex dollar, and if libertie be granted they shall be removed within twentie four hours eftir upon charge of these that laid them on.

Item, no boat is to cast out any dirt, stones, or any other thing, within any plae of the river under the penalty of a rex dollar.

Item, that no boat sailing up and down the river shall have their oares standing out but shall have their oars laid along'st the syde within the boat, under the pain of fyve pound *tories quoties*, attour being lyable for the dammage, and getting no satisfaction for the dammage they shall sustain in doing in the contrair.

Item, that the water serjeants shall cleanse the river before the key of all the loose stones, red and sand, that shall ly higher then the underbed of the groundstain of the key, two tymes each year, under the penalty of two rex dollars for each failyie; and for that effect ane drage or harle is to be made.

Item, that the baillie punish cursing and swearing, conforme to the acts of parliament.

Thir statutes and rules are to be openly proclaimed three severall weeks successively, upon such a day of the week when boats and the resort on the key is strongest, and eftirward to be affixed upon the cran, and a double therof upon the bridge port.

On 15th February, 1696, the town council, considering that as yet no settled measures or weights were in Port-Glasgow, appointed that the pecks, weights, elnwands and stoups to be thereafter used there should be according to the standards of Glasgow, and be sealed with the seal of the dean of guild of the city.² On 25th April, 1696, in consequence of several merchants, burgesses of Glasgow, livering and loading their ships and other vessels at Greenock and Carsdykes, and not at the town's free port of Port-Glasgow, the town council appointed the magistrates and others to inquire into the practice, and report to the town clerk, that he might draw up a libel against them in order to pursuing them before the town council.³

The tacksmen of the harbour dues at Port-Glasgow, having represented to the town council various objections and difficulties they had met with in uplifting

¹ When these dues were about to be roused with the rest of the common good, the town eounceil, on 28th May, 1697, fixed also the dues of the crane which was not in a "sufficient case" at the time when the other dues of the Broomielaw were arranged (Glasgow Records, IV., p. 242).

² Glasgow Records, IV., pp. 193, 203.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 202-3.

the dues, and a committee which was appointed to confer with them having reported thereon, the town council, on 16th January, 1697, agreed upon the following "answers and determinationes," which afford interesting particulars as to the management of the port at that time:—

(1) As to the first article of the saids representationes and complaints (viz., that it is objected to the tacksmein that fisher boats are exeeded by law and pays nothing through the kingdome) they hereby appoynt that dureing the tyme that the herring fishing is in the river of Clyde, within the Cloch Stone, every fisher boat shall be free to come and goe to the harbour of Portglasgow, for payment only of six shilling eight pennies Scotts for each fisher boat dureing that season, and when the fishing is without the Cloch Stone then every fisher boat is to be considered and pay according to her burden, conforme to other boats tradeing up and downe the river of Clyde.

(2) As to the second article of the saids representationes and complaints (viz., that Renfrew and Dumbartoune boats refuse payment of any dueties of the said harbour and road, pretending that there is a pactione betwixt the burgh of Glasgow and them for exemption) the saids magistrates and toune counsell know nothing of any such paction and agreement, and yet being willing to deall freindly and kindly with their saids neighbouring burghs, doe therefore appoynt the tacksmein only to exact for all ships, barks and boats belonging the burgesses and inhabitants of the saids tuo burghs, as for ships, barks and boats belonging to burgess inhabitants of this burgh, and in respect this ease is only granted as a favour to the saids tuo burghs therefore the said ease is only appoynted to continue dureing the pleasure of the magistrates and toune counsell of this burgh; as also in regard the tacksmein by their commission are not restricted to the said ease given as said is, but have power to exact from the burges inhabitants of the saids tuo burghs as from strangers, therefore the magistrates and toune counsell appoynts the tacksmein to keep ane exact accompt of all ships, barks and boats belonging to the said tuo burghs that come to the said road and harbour from tyme to tyme, and of what the dues thereof fall short, be the favour and ease forsaid granted to them, to the effect the tacksmein may have allowance thereof in their tackduetie.

(3) As to the third article in relation to gabarts, pretending that they ought to pay more then is contained in the fourth article of the dueties established be the toune counsell and instructiones from the counsell thereanent, upon this account that the second and third articles of the saids instructiones anent the dueties forsaids mentiones ships, barks and other vessels, and so the words other vessels should comprehend gabarts above the burden of twelve tuns, in answear to which representacione the magistrates and toune counsell find that the words other vessels (comprehended in the said second and third articles), being joyned to the words ships and barks, can only comprehend vessels of the same nature and quality of ships and barks, but can nowayes be understood of gabarts, especially consideringe that the subsequent fourth article is composed of gabarts, and has a speciaill relation to them, and so find that gabarts whether great or small ought to pay no more than the dues contained in the said fourth article of instructiones made be the toune counsell as said is.

(4) As to the fourth article of the saids representationes and complaints made be the saids tacksmein (viz., that the heretors of Portglasgow pretend exemption by their chartours) the magistrates and toune counsell returnes this answear thereunto that non of the saids heretors have exemption by their few-rights except William Arbuckle and George Lyon, so that all others of the saids heretors are lyeable in payment conforme to the instructions and rates made, and therefore the tacksmein are sufficiently impowered by their commission to exact accordingly, and appoynts the tacksmein to keep ane exact accompt of the vessels and boats belonging to the saids William Arbuckle and George Lyon that come to the said road and

harbour from tyme to tyme and of the dues they are lyeable to, to the effect the tacksmen may have allowance thereof in their tackduetie.

(5) As to the fyfth article of the saids representationes and complaints (viz., that it is objected to the tacksmen that the toune has no right to nor are infest in the road of Portglasgow, and therefore that every man is free there without payeing of anchorage or dues) as to which it is awseweard that the objection is false and the toune hes a reall right to the road as weell as to the harbour, conforme to their chartours and acts of parliament in their favours, and that therefore the dues are to be exacted off all ships rideing, livering and loading in the said road conforme to the instructions.

(6) As to the sixth article, wherein they doe complaine that the baillie of Portglasgow giveth them no concurrance, but upon the contrarie all discouragement in exacting the dues due and payable conforme to the particular articles of the instructions made and given be the toune counsell, and therefore doe crave that the tacksmen and their servants may be empowered to poynd and distrenzie if they refuse to pay the dues; as to which article the magistrates and toune counsell refuse to committ any such power to the tacksmen or their servants, least it may occasion confusion and disorder, but allowes and appoyns the tacksmen or their servants to take a pand or pledge from the refusers to pay their dues, and keep and detaine the samen untill the dues be payed or the baillie determine therewith; and lykewayes the magistrates and toune counsell doe hereby appoyn their baillie at Portglasgow to give all due concurrance to their tacksmen and their servants for uplifting of the dues, conforme to the articles and instructiones made therancient, as also conforme to thir presents, and that by poynding and distrenzicing in such cases; and in case of the baillies refuseall that the tacksmen or their servants take instruments and protest against the baillie for their damages for which he ought to be lyeable.

And farder appoyns the clerk to give ane extract hereof to the saids tacksmen, and ane other extract hereof to the baillie at Portglasgow, who are hereby appoyned to observe the samen in tyme comeing.

Taking into consideration that the lords commissioners for plantation of kirks and valuation of teinds had authorised the erection of a kirk at Newport, on condition that Glasgow undertook to provide the minister to serve the cure of the kirk with a stipend of 800 merks at least, and that the teinds, parsonage, and vicarage of the parish of Kilmalcolm should not be burdened in any time coming with the provision of the minister or his successors, or any part thereof, the town council on 27th June, 1696, subscribed a bond, in which they undertook to implement the condition above set forth.¹

On 2nd July, 1695, the convention, referring to the fact that the foundation of the bridge at Dumbarton had not even then been laid, ordered that so soon as this was done the contribution by the burghs would commence.² What the cause of this delay was is not stated, but it appears from an entry in the Dumbarton records, on 4th July, 1691, that stones designed for the bridge were sold to the Laird of Kilmaronock.³ MacLeod states that the building of the bridge was not begun till 1754, eighty-three years after the matter was first mooted.⁴

After a time the commodious creek in Little Cumbrae, which was established

¹ Glasgow Records, IV., pp. 207-8.

² Convention Records, IV., p. 197.

³ Irving's Dumbarton Records, p. 100.

⁴ MacLeod's Dumbarton Records, pp. 46, 47.

as the harbour of Irvine, appears to have been given up, and on 16th July, 1695, Irvine obtained an act of parliament setting forth that its harbour was ruined and lying in rubbish and the trade of the town quite decayed, and also that the bridge over the water of Irvine was much decayed. To enable the burgh to make the necessary repairs, &c., it was authorised to impose a tax of one mark on each boll of malt ground at its mill for a period of ten years. For the proper application of this imposition, the magistrates, council and managers were to account yearly to certain specified persons.¹

Towards the close of the seventeenth century, Scotland had so far wakened up to the necessity for emancipating itself from the narrow, restrictive policy of the past, and of entering upon a new career of commercial enterprise at home and abroad. Of this, as regarded the communication of trade to unfree burghs, the establishment of important institutions for developing the resources of the country at home and abroad, and the general trend of the legislation during the reigns of William and Mary are indications. The act 1695, c. 73, is thus significant, though in a dangerous direction. It sanctioned, and even encouraged, the hazardous policy of allowing the administrators of the common good of burghs to adventure their money in foreign trade.² In accordance with this authority the town council of Glasgow, on 5th April, 1696, resolved to invest £3,000 sterling in the Darien scheme.³

Meanwhile Sir John Shaw Stewart, the second baronet, who had succeeded his father in 1694, was following out his policy of promoting the interests of Greenock. On 12th October, 1696, he obtained an act of parliament authorising him to have three yearly fairs there⁴—one on the first Wednesday of January for horses, cows, and other merchant goods, with a horse market every Thursday after the first Wednesday of January till the middle of March; the second on the third Wednesday of April for cows and merchant goods; and the third on the second Wednesday of August for cows and other cattle and merchant goods—with all the customs and casualties of the fairs and markets. And on the 22nd of the previous month he submitted an overture for building a harbour at his burgh, which, after being read, was remitted to the committee on trade.⁵ On the 19th of August, 1698, Sir John again petitioned parliament for an imposition on liquors brewed and sold in Greenock, the proceeds to be applied in building and repairing the harbour of the burgh, and the petition was remitted to the committee on trade.⁶ On 29th November, 1700, he and his elder son craved parliament to pass an act brought in from the committee to which the application

¹ 1695, c. 61. Acts of Parliament, IX., p. 458. Muniments of Irvine, I., pp. 117-8.

² 1695, c. 73. Acts of Parliament, IX., p. 463.

³ Glasgow Records, IV., p. 194. The payments made by Glasgow on account of their subscription were, in terms of the Union settlement, repaid on 16th September, 1707 (*Ibid.*, p. 408).

⁴ 1696, c. 85. Acts of Parliament, X., p. 107. ⁶ Acts of Parliament, X., p. 145.

⁵ *Ibid.*, X., p. 18.

of 1698 appears to have been remitted, allowing the imposition. The draft of the act was, however, ordered to lie on the table, that all parties interested might see it.¹ The result of the negotiations of the convention of burghs with Sir John and the influence he exercised seem to have helped forward the movement for removing the shackles on trade and industry which had hitherto restrained them. These were inconsistent with both civic and national advancement, and, though the immediate object of his efforts was to emancipate his own burgh of Greenock, he deserves recognition as one of the earliest and most strenuous labourers for municipal freedom. Nor did what he sought for, and so far accomplished, come too soon. For, under the paralysing influence of the old burghal system, which had outlived its day, even the royal burghs, which that system was designed to promote, were languishing and falling into decrepitude. The complaints of poverty, which had long been presented to the Convention of Burghs, and the frequent appointments of commissioners to enquire and report as to the condition of many of the burghs, attest this; and, obviously, no system of grants in aid could afford anything like adequate relief to the impecunious burghs. Every grant only crippled the resources of the relieving body, which could ill afford to make it.

On 1st September, 1698, parliament passed an act for further clearing the trade allowed to burghs of barony and regality and others who were not freemen of royal burghs. By it the exporting of native goods and the importing of foreign goods were declared to be the exclusive privileges of freemen and burgesses of royal burghs, and of such as had the privilege communicated. But from this exclusion the exportation of corns, cattle, horse, nolt, sheep, coal, salt, metal and mineral, lime, and stone was excepted. Noblemen and barons retained the privilege which they had previously enjoyed of exporting native products growing or manufactured on their own lands, and of importing foreign commodities for their own use to the value of what they exported, but not for sale. From the exclusive privileges of freemen and burgesses of royal burghs were also excepted the privileges granted by law to declared manufactories and societies for fishing. It was declared, however, that the inhabitants of burghs of regality and barony and others might in future trade, buy, and sell all native commodities, and retail foreign commodities, provided they bought them from freemen of royal burghs, or burghs which had the communication of trade, and who paid scot and lot within burghs. The grant of these privileges to royal burghs was appointed to have execution in terms of the Act 1690, c. 15.²

On the same day another act was passed (1) for terminating the difference between royal burghs and burghs of regality and others as to the communication of trade appointed by the Act of 1693, c. 51, and especially as to the subdivision

¹ *Acts of Parliament*, X., pp. 221, 231.

² 1698, c. 38. *Acts of Parliament*, X., p. 176. 1690, c. 15. *Ibid.*, IX., p. 152.

of the ten per cent. of the tax roll of royal burghs, declared by that act to be the proportion undertaken by burghs of regality and barony and others which were to partake of the communication during the endurance of Buchan's contract; and (2) for determining what should be the quota of the tax roll to be laid thereafter on burghs of regality and barony and others which should partake of the communication, and how the sum should be apportioned amongst them. By the Act 1698, c. 38, the communication of trade ordained by the Act of 1693 was ratified, and, in order to make the communication more effectual, commissioners were to be nominated by the King to convene in Edinburgh, and consider as to bygones preceding the expiration of Buchan's contract, how the £10, with Buchan's expenses, as modified by them, might be most equally proportioned among the burghs of regality and barony and other unfree traders, as well those who had got the benefit of the communication as those who had not got it, so that for the space foresaid they might be fully discharged of all hazard of unfree trading. The commissioners were likewise appointed to consider, for the year subsequent to the expiration of Buchan's contract to Lammas, and thereafter what quota of the tax roll of £100 of the burghs royal should be laid on the unfree traders of the kingdom, and to subdivide and proportion it upon the burghs of regality and barony, and such others as had got or should get the benefit of the communication, as the commissioners might find just. The commissioners were empowered to take all steps necessary for fulfilling this commission, and their sentences and decrets were declared to have the force of an act of parliament. When the quota and subdivision were thus fixed, all persons inhabitants of burghs partaking the communication were appointed to be stented for it as in royal burghs. It was further declared that, thereafter, these burghs should be liable to the determination of the Convention of Burghs as to the alteration of their quota as royal burghs, but it was provided that these alterations should not increase the general quota laid on unfree trade, as also that, in case of inequality, the burgh injured might apply for remedy to parliament, and that, in case of the increase or decrease of trade, the burghs concerned, whether royal or not, might apply to parliament even as to the general quotas.¹

On 10th January, 1699, the Lord Chancellor produced a commission under the great seal to eleven noblemen and gentlemen, empowering them to settle the communication of trade between the royal burghs and the burghs of regality and barony and other unfree traders in pursuance of the Act 1698, c. 39. The commission, having been duly constituted, was intimated to the royal burghs, burghs of regality and barony, and others interested, and they were ordered to appear.² To this commmission Buchan applied to obtain payment of £90,000 Scots, advanced by him under his arrangement with the convention, and he was ordered

¹ 1698, c. 39. *Acts of Parliament*, X., pp. 176-7.

² *Acts of Parliament*, X., App., p. 107.

to lodge a scheme showing the quotas to be put upon the burghs of regality and barony concerned in the free trade, with the quotas to be put on the several places to satisfy his claims.¹ The amount of his claim having been fixed, the royal burghs were ordered to pay him conform to the stent roll, and on 17th March the committee of the commission reported the particular quotas of the unfree traders which they submitted for consideration. These quotas, with the objections offered to them, were then dealt with, and finally approved. The proportion affeiring to Renfrew was fifteen shillings and sixpence, whereof payable by the unfree traders in the parish of Inverkip, belonging to the Lairds of Blackhill and Castlemilk, 2s.; by the town and parish of Paisley, 4s.; by the bay of Newark and parish of Houston, 6d.; by the parish of Greenock, 9s.; with relief to the parish of Greenock from the other unfree traders within the shire, to be divided by the parish, with concurrence of Lord Boyle, Sir James Smollet, or any one of them, payable to Renfrew.² In his "Old Greenock" Mr. Williamson states that the commissioners of supply of Renfrewshire presented to the commission of the Scottish parliament for settling the communication of trade offers to relieve the royal burghs of a certain proportion of cess for the privilege of trade to which these burghs had exclusive right. Among others, Sir John Shaw offered five shillings Scots for the freedom to himself and the inhabitants of Greenock, and James Tailzeour, merchant in Crawfordsdyke, for himself and that village, and the laird of Cartsburn's tenants in Greenock offered eighteen pennies Scots. Renfrew, the only royal burgh in the county, objected to this offer as not proportionable to the trade of the places. The commissioners accordingly held an inquiry at Paisley on 30th April, and reported that the offers ought to be received and sustained, but against this finding Renfrew protested.³

On 5th February, 1705, a committee of the convention had under consideration an offer by Sir John Shaw⁴ to pay for his town of Greenock five shillings Scots of the tax roll, commencing from July, 1697, and two shillings Scots for the rest of the parish of Greenock from that time and in future. This offer they accepted, and appointed the agent of the burgh to exact payment thereof, with interest, from the respective terms of payment, and to assign Sir John into the right to conduct unfree trade during the above-mentioned period.⁵ The agreement thus

¹ Acts of Parliament, X., App., p. 110.

² Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, X., pp. 110-148. Sir John had a claim against Port-Glasgow for its quota from Lammas, 1692, to Lammas, 1698, and this was settled by a payment of £512 Scots in 1701 (Glasgow Charters, IV., pp. 314-5).

³ Williamson's "Old Greenock," pp. 25, 26.

⁴ This Sir John succeeded to the estate in 1702. On 8th August of that year the town treasurer of Glasgow was authorised to pay £72 18s. 4d. to Thomas Sheills, in Port-Glasgow, "spent att his house be the provest, baillies, and dean of gild, with diverse others of the inhabitants attending them, when att Sir John Shaw's burial in May last" (Glasgow Records, IV., p. 356).

⁵ Convention Records, IV., p. 359.

made was ratified by the convention on 9th July, and it was remitted to the committee on unfree trade to determine as to an agreement for the future.¹ On 13th July it was reported that £3,125 Scots (£260 8s. 4d. sterling) had been received from Sir John Shaw for past trade,² and subsequent payments are also referred to in the Convention Records.³

The change that was coming over public opinion as to the impolicy of maintaining the restrictions of the old burghal system, and of opening up the commerce of the country to a healthy competition, seems to have led both Dumbarton and Glasgow, in view, possibly, of the decision of the courts of law, to agree to a reference of the questions which had so long distracted them. On 14th August, 1699, the town council of Glasgow, “being certainly informed that the towne of Dumbartownes tacksmen, or uthers in their name, doe committ abusses within the towne of Glasgow their road and harbour of Port Glasgow, by exacting anchorage and other dewties for shippes, barks and other vessells within the said road and harbour, and takeing poynds and pawnds therefor, contrarie to all law and equitie;” and being resolved to stop such practices within their “free erected port, road and harbour,” authorised their bailie of Port-Glasgow to act accordingly.⁴ Communings between the two burghs followed, and on 4th November it was agreed that a consultation should be held at Edinburgh, “in presence of lawyers and freends,” with the view of settling differences.⁵ An arrangement was arrived at, and its terms reported to Glasgow town council on 20th January, 1700.⁶ The burghs thereafter entered into a formal contract, in which, referring to the litigation which had taken place between them, and the decision of the court of session in favour of Glasgow, it set forth that several new questions had arisen between them as to the extent of their several privileges. To terminate the “animositie” and difference thus occasioned, and to effect “a lasting friendship in all time heirafter,” Dumbarton confirmed the decree of declarator against it in 1666, and also the decree of absolvitor in favour of Glasgow, with the possession attained by it in virtue of these decreets, and discharged all claim to the duties claimed by Dumbarton and thereby disallowed. Moreover, considering that the levying by Dumbarton of the dues on shipping to which it was found entitled caused the burgh much trouble, vexation, and expense, and that other questions existed which it was desirable to have settled, Dumbarton sold and disposed to Glasgow all the dues formerly payable to it, therein specified (other than the dues of ships belonging to freemen of Dumbarton)—without prejudice, however, to the freedoms, liberties, and immunities of the burgh otherwise. It was declared, moreover, that these burghs should be thereafter free at each other’s ports—Glasgow at Dumbar-

¹ Convention Records, IV., p. 370.

⁴ Glasgow Records, IV., pp. 288 9.

² *Ibid.*, IV., p. 374.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 291-2.

³ *Ibid.*, V., pp. 162, 211, 217, 333.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 294-7.

ton, and Dumbarton at Glasgow, Broomielaw, Port-Glasgow, and any other port or harbour belonging to Glasgow. In consideration of the agreement thus come to, Glasgow paid to Dumbarton 4,500 merks Scots (£250 sterling), to be applied in payment of its debt *pro tanto*. But it was agreed that the contract should not take effect till ratified by parliament. It was dated on 12th, 28th, and 29th June, 1700, submitted to the convention on 9th July, 1700, and ratified and ordered to be recorded, and on 31st January, 1701, it was ratified by parliament.¹

On 30th January, 1700, the town council of Glasgow authorised the treasurer to pay Robert Thompson, postmaster, £16 Scots "for his present help in keeping up of a post to goe twice a week to Port Glasgow" for a year from the preceding April, but this was not to infer any obligation for the future.²

On 4th July, 1700, the convention, on considering a petition by Dumbarton for assistance, appointed commissioners to visit and report on the common good, trade, and public works of the burgh.³ On 10th July, 1702, it appointed a committee to visit Glasgow and report as to its common good, trade, and public works,⁴ and on 4th July, 1704, allowed Dumbarton £50 sterling, to be expended

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 300, 307-313. 1701, c. 27. Acts of Parliament, X., pp. 322-30. Municipal Corporation Reports, I., p. 498. Glasgow Records, IV., pp. 304-6. Glasgow Charters, II., pp. 280-9, Nos. 171-2. The arrangements made by the contract were altered and the deed rescinded by the Clyde Navigation Act, 6 George IV., c. 117 (1825).

² Glasgow Records, IV., p. 297.

³ Convention Records, IV., p. 297.

⁴ *Ibid.*, IV., p. 340. During the preceding six years there are in the acts of parliament occasional references to the establishment of new manufactories in Glasgow. Thus, on 9th October, 1696, an act of parliament was passed incorporating Hugh and James Montgomerie, merchants, and such others as they might assume, into a company for a sugar manufactory, with liberties and immunities to continue for nineteen years; and appointed it to be called the "New Sugar Manufactory of Glasgow" (Glasgow Charters, IV., p. 418). By an act of parliament dated 30th August, 1698, which narrates "that there is a manufactory set up at the toun of Glasgow for makeing of ropes and cordage for the use of shipping or for other uses in the country, and lykewayes considering that the cordage imported from the Sound and the East Seas is nowayes sufficient," it was, for the encouragement of the said manufactory, ordained that a duty of 50s. Scots should be imposed on each hundredweight of cords and ropes imported from the Sound or East Seas for sale. In the year 1700 the following applications had been made to parliament for the establishment of manufactories in Glasgow:—(1) On 12th November by James Montgomery, younger, merchant, to erect soap and glass works; (2) on 18th November by Mathew and Daniel Campbells, merchants, to erect a sugar manufactory, and a manufactory for distilling brandy and strong waters; (3) on 23rd December by James and William Walkinshaw, and other merchants, to erect a manufactory of cordage, canvas, and other necessaries for shipping; (4) on same day by William Corse, merchant, to erect a new sugar manufactory (Glasgow Charters, II., p. 422).

Some of the vicissitudes incident to the pursuit of merchandise are alluded to in a petition to parliament on 8th August, 1698, by John Gilhagie, merchant in Glasgow. By a recent fire in the Saltmarket he had lost his houses, plenishing, and merchant ware, valued at 20,000 merks, "as also, in the same year, by trade in his several voyages and concerns in ships to the

in repairing its waterworks, which were much decayed.¹ It also granted £40 Scots to the burgh of Rutherglen.²

On 7th August, 1703, Renfrew obtained from Queen Anne, as coming in place of the Prince and Steward of Scotland, a charter of *Novodamus*. It confirmed the charter of Robert III. in 1396 and two charters of James VI., dated respectively 5th February, 1575, and 14th August, 1614. The last charter of James, say the Municipal Commissioners, appears to have conveyed very valuable privileges. It confirmed or conferred a right of ferry on the Clyde between Merlinford and the mouth of the Gryff; and the right to the small duties, customs, and tolls within the burgh and barony; to a mill; to chapels and altarages within the burgh for the support of the poor, and to a grammar school. It also confirmed the right to choose a provost and dean of guild; a right of free port, harbour, and haven such as Edinburgh had in Leith; of trade and traffic, foreign and home, with the right to levy customs within the bounds of the burgh, both maritime and inland; a right to a merchant guild, with guild court, as in Edinburgh; to markets, fairs, and customs at these fairs; and various other privileges. It gave an exclusive right to trade in the barony of Renfrew, saving the rights of the burgh of Dumbarton; conveyed extensive property in land and fishings in the Clyde, a right to draw certain payments from land, cottars, and householders, various specified duties to be drawn at its harbour, to be applied to its repair, and a right to levy customs on the Clyde. It also incorporated the burgh, with all its liberties, into a free burgh.³

Sir John Shaw having failed to receive from the Scottish Parliament the assistance which he sought in the formation of the harbour he desired to establish, appears to have made arrangements with his feuars, and to have raised funds for the purpose conform to a contract between them; and on 1st May, Arehangell, Canaries, and Madairies (which was the first undertakings to those plantations from Glasgow), and by one ship of his at the same time coming from France with wynes here being east away at the bay of Yochill, on the west side of Ireland, he had £500 sterling of loss; and since that time he has had of coall works near Glasgow, these some years bypast, above 20,000 merks of loss." Gilhagie asked, and was granted, "protection against personall execution, it being notour that he did not squander away his means by prodigality" (*Ibid.*, p. 420).

Mr. Henry Grey Graham draws an uninviting picture of Scottish trade at the beginning of the eighteenth century, when, he says, "the country was in dire poverty—a famishing people, a stagnant trade, rude manufactures and profitless industries. Glasgow was a small city of 12,500 inhabitants, which had a slender trade in exporting salt fish and coarse woollen stuff and tarred rope, and a crude industry in making rough plaiding. Paisley was a long row of thatched dwellings, whose 2,600 inhabitants depended on spinning yarn on rock and reel, which was woven at hand looms by eighty-seven weavers, who sold their stuff at the cross in the markets to English pedlars. Greenock, with a population of 1,500, was a collection of rude cottages, with a business consisting in fishing for salmon and herrings in the Clyde" (Social Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century, 1906 edition, p. 508).

¹ Convention Records, IV., p. 355.

² *Ibid.*, IV., p. 357.

³ Municipal Corporation Reports, II., pp. 355-6. Caledonia, III., p. 803

1704, he entered into a contract with John Anderson, mason in Ayr, for the taking charge of the construction of the harbour in all its parts. By that contract Sir John became bound to pay to Anderson £300 Scots (£25 sterling) yearly, "during his attendance and overseeing the work, with a sufficient house and yard."¹

On 4th October, 1705, the dean of guild and brethren and most part of the trading merchant rank of Glasgow, referring to the establishment of Port-Glasgow, and to the fact that several merchants of the city had, contrary to various acts of parliament, statutes of the convention of burghs, laws, and practices of the realm, and the obligation subscribed by them on 13th December, 1692,² carried their ships, barks, and other vessels to several harbours of the Clyde, and there laid them up and rigged them out, to the great detriment and discouragement of the inhabitants of Port-Glasgow, the shippers and other mariners residing there; for remeid thereof ordained that no merchant within the city should in time coming lay up any of his vessels, dress or fit out the same, at any other port or harbour upon the Clyde, save at the port of Glasgow, except in case of necessity; in which case he should be obliged to lay up, dress, and fit the same at a royal burgh, and that under the pains and penalties contained in the said acts of parliament and convention of burghs, to be exacted of the traveiners without any defalcation.³

On 12th February, 1706, the Privy Council had under consideration a petition by Irvine for a general contribution to enable the harbour to be repaired. It set forth that the harbour, where the ships and boats lay, and the entry thereto, was environed by sand hills in the south, north, and part of the east quarters, so that, as the wind blew from the several "airts," shelves and banks arose in the river, which hindered the incoming and outgoing of ships; that the neighbours and inhabitants of the burgh had laboured with their hands and expended of the common good and private fortunes till they were overpowered; and that, in consequence, those who were in use to come with their ships were prevented from coming in and going off at seasonable times. On considering the petition, the Privy Council granted the burgh a voluntary contribution, to be collected within all the parish churches of the kingdom upon such days as the burgh might appoint, either at the church doors or in such other manner as might be arranged, "for repairing the harbour, removing the shelves and banks, and maintaining the harbour when cleared."⁴

Glasgow had afterwards to pass through a succession of untoward experiences. The failure of the Darien scheme,⁵ in which many of the citizens were largely

¹ Williamson's Old Greenock, pp. 26, 27, 284.

³ Merchants' House of Glasgow, pp. 149, 150.

² Glasgow Charters, vol. II., pp. 243-6,

⁴ Muniments of Irvine, II., p. 128.

No. 162; *antea*, pp. 139-40.

⁵ On 14th September, 1699, the last of the expeditions under the Darien scheme sailed from Rothesay bay. It consisted of four frigates, with 1,200 emigrants, among whom was the last of the once potent Stewarts of Minto, who was not even a shareholder in the Company (Pagan's Glasgow, p. 55).

interested, brought a loss upon Scotland of nearly £220,000—serious to all, and ruinous to many in the then impoverished state of the country. It was probably in consideration of these and other adverse circumstances of that period that, on 8th July, 1706, the convention recommended a petition of Glasgow, representing its great and unsupportable burdens, to the ensuing convention, which, on 5th July, 1707, in consideration of the bad circumstances of the town, with the great loss it had then lately sustained in its shipping, appointed the agent to pay it 2,000 merks Scots of present supply, and to make the condition of the burgh a head of the next general missive.¹ Even the negotiations for the union with England, which King James VI. had been anxious to accomplish, and which Cromwell, with statesman-like sagacity, desired to promote, were injurious for a time to commercial pursuits. It was strenuously opposed in Glasgow, and resulted in serious riots, which were described by Defoe in his *History of the Union* (1709).² Dumbarton also opposed it.³ Nevertheless the union was effected on 1st May, 1707, in the reign of Queen Anne.

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 392, 406.

² Extracts from his History are given in M'Ure's *History of Glasgow* (1830 edition), pp. 318-27.

³ Irving's *Dumbarton Records*, p. 564.

VIII.

FROM THE UNION TILL THE MIDDLE OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, 1707-51.

On the accession of Queen Anne, on 8th March, 1702, the claim of Scotland to be admitted to equal trading privileges with England again came to the front, and was formulated by the Scottish commissioners into a demand for free trade between the two nations; the same regulations and duties in both countries for importation and exportation; equal privileges to the shipping and seamen of the two nations; and neither nation to be burdened with the debts of the other, or, if they were to be so, an equivalent to be paid to Scotland as to the nation more unequally so burdened. Much fruitless negotiation thereupon took place with the English commissioners without prospect of a satisfactory conclusion, whereupon the commission was adjourned by royal letter on 4th October, 1703, and on 9th September the Scottish parliament terminated the Scottish commission. The unfriendly, and even hostile, feeling that was growing up in Scotland towards England manifested itself in the Scottish parliaments of 1703 and 1704, and unless an amicable arrangement between the two countries could be effected, the prospect of civil war was not distant. Under the caution and restraint which this condition of matters inspired, the English parliament passed an act for the entire Union of the kingdoms. It authorised commissioners to be appointed to meet with any commissioners who might be appointed by the parliament of Scotland. Notwithstanding several unpropitious circumstances, the English overtures were considered by the Scottish parliament on 25th August, 1705, and on 1st September it was resolved to appoint commissioners to treat with the English commissioners. But it was represented to the Queen that before the commissioners met the English act—which was considered hostile to Scotland—must be repealed. This condition having been given effect to, so far as was necessary, the commissioners of both countries met on 16th April, thirty-one on each side, and concluded on 23rd July, 1706. The articles of conference were immediately submitted to the Queen, who expressed the desire that the matter should be brought before the Scottish parliament without loss of time. The Jacobite party, foreseeing that the Union would give a deathblow to their cause, adopted every means

to foster opposition ; the press denounced it ; the merchants were warned of the disastrous results of Union to trade and commerce ; workmen were told of increased cost of food ; the convention of burghs opposed it ; and although the unionists were not silent, the popular preponderance was with the opposition. About the middle of October, 1706, parliament entered on the consideration of the Articles of Union, and, after a series of protracted debates, concluded on the 16th January, 1707, when an act ratifying and approving the Treaty of Union was passed by 110 to 69 ; and the act was afterwards touched with the royal sceptre by her Majesty's high commissioner. Among the opponents of the Union, says Burton, were the Cameronian Covenanters of the south, and the Jacobite Highlanders of the north, and in Glasgow, " which might be called the point of junction where these extremes met," a series of popular outbreaks took place. The house of the provost, John Aird, was attacked and gutted on 7th September, and for some days the city was in the hands of the rioters. But it is unnecessary to particularise these disorders, which did not prevent the Scottish parliament from passing the measure, which has proved so beneficial to both countries, and not least to Glasgow.¹

In the first parliament of Great Britain, Scotland was allotted forty-five representatives, of whom thirteen were to be appointed by the shires and fifteen by the royal burghs. One group of the latter consisted of Glasgow, Rutherglen, Renfrew, and Dumbarton. At the first election, delegates of these burghs met at Glasgow on 26th May, 1708, and chose Robert Rodger, provost of Glasgow, as member.²

Though unpopular in Scotland for many years, the Union, by placing English and Scottish merchants on an equal footing, proved most beneficial to the city. " Ruinous to the seaport towns on the east coast of Scotland, it seems," says

¹ Professor Hume Brown remarks with reference to the Union thus effected, that it was connected by the strictest relations of cause and effect with the almost unanimous resolution of the Scottish Estates in 1560 that Protestantism should thenceforth be the national religion of Scotland. But for the decision of 1560 the question that had to be settled in 1706-7 could never have arisen. Had Scotland remained a Roman Catholic country, the Union of the Crowns could hardly in the nature of things have taken place, and the Union of the Parliaments would have been excluded alike by the laws of God and man. By their common Protestantism the two countries were united in a bond which drew them into relations which of necessity tended to become closer and more complex, and which gradually convinced both nations that they were committed to conjoint interests and a conjoint destiny. However widely different their national traditions and their national characteristics ; despite their hereditary hostility, four centuries old, they had one common enemy whom they had never ceased to dread, and against whom the instinct of self-preservation constrained them to joint action. This common enemy was Catholic Europe, in whose eyes Protestant Britain was an offence against Heaven and a standing reproach and menace to the community of nations (Scottish Historical Review, vol. IV., pp. 121-2).

² Glasgow Records, IV., pp. 425-7.

Andrew Brown, "to have collected and carried the spirit of commerce to Glasgow, and the merchants, availing themselves of their vicinity to the Atlantic Ocean, embarked in the American trade with a rapidity unequalled in the history of commerce, and brought home the produce of America in Whitehaven bottoms."¹

Between 1660 and 1707, says Gibson, a spirit for commerce appears to have been raised among the inhabitants of Glasgow. The citizens who seem to have distinguished themselves during this period were Walter Gibson and John Anderson. Gibson cured and packed in one year 300 lasts of herring, which he sent to St. Martins, in France, on board of a Dutch vessel, called the "St. Agate," of 450 tons burden. His returns were brandy and salt. He was the first who imported iron from Stockholm into the Clyde. Anderson is said to have been the first who imported white wines.²

Notwithstanding the exceptional success which appears to have attended the efforts of the early pioneers of Glasgow's commercial energy, the financial condition of the city seems to have been unsatisfactory, for on 15th July, 1708, it petitioned the convention again for pecuniary assistance, and succeeded in obtaining an order on the agent to pay it 1,000 merks Scots "of gratuity," the grant being made on the curious ground of respect for "Robert Rodger, their present provost and commissioner."³

The depression of which Glasgow thus complained appears to have extended to all the royal burghs at this time, and the records of the convention are full of complaints and applications for assistance which, even when granted, could only afford very temporary relief. Probably Glasgow was less depressed than even many of the burghs at this time. Yet its complaints were very lugubrious, and its applications for authority to levy imposts contrast the flourishing conditions in which the city had formerly been with those to which it was then reduced. The exhaustion was partly attributed to the heavy burdens which had been imposed upon the city during several previous years, loading it with a debt amounting in 1691-2 to £178,800 Scots (£14,900 sterling). There was likewise, along with complaint of languishing trade, a lamentation over "the estate and peril and danger of their brig, the sanding of their water, and the destruction of their green for want of calsay and brigs, to the apparent decay of their city," unless an impost were authorised.⁴

For some time previously the agent of the convention of burghs had been engaged in negotiating with unfree burghs as to the terms on which they were to be permitted to have "communication of trade." But his success hitherto had not been satisfactory. On 15th July, accordingly, the convention, "considering that few of the burghs of barony and regality had agreed" for the communication, appointed a committee with full power, *inter alia*, not only to agree with unfree

¹ Brown's History of Glasgow, II., p. 37.

³ Convention Records, IV., 466.

² Gibson's History of Glasgow, p. 205.

⁴ *Antea*, pp. 45, 134.

traders that shall make offer, but also to continue or heighten the proportions of those who have agreed, as they shall see cause.¹

Port-Glasgow having rapidly increased in size and importance after the Union, extended itself over the adjacent village of Newark, which was a burgh of barony belonging to Mr. Hamilton, of Wishaw.² An attempt to have the custom-house established at Greenock has been referred to.³ On 10th June 1707, Provost Aird, of Glasgow, wrote to the earl of Mar, secretary of state, that Sir John Shaw was endeavouring, by his interest at the Court, to obtain the transfer of the custom-house from Port-Glasgow to Greenock, and stating that "he formerly tried to have this done in 1694, but the lords of the treasury, after hearing the city of Glasgow, refused. Greenock," it is added, "is only a burgh of barony, and Glasgow is a royal burgh, and bears much of the public burdens."⁴ In his "Caledonia," Chalmers states that Port-Glasgow was established the principal custom-house port of the Clyde by an exchequer commission, dated the 16th September, 1710.⁵

In 1707 the construction of the harbour at Greenock (afterwards known as the west quay), for which the assessment of one shilling and fourpence was arranged by Sir John Shaw in 1705, was commenced, and completed in 1710, at a cost of upwards of 100,000 merks Scots (£5,555 sterling). As originally constructed, the harbour consisted of an east quay and a west quay, of circular form, enclosing an area of 8 acres 3 roods and 10 falls, and having a tongue or jetty (the mid quay) extending into the harbour.⁶

A census ordered by the magistrates in 1708, a year after the union, showed that the population then was 12,766, being 818 more than in 1688. Four years later—viz., in 1712—it had increased to 13,832. In the latter year the rental of the built portion of the city is said to have been £7,840 sterling; the burgh roads, lands, mills, and New Green were estimated at £1,068; together £8,903 sterling.⁷

It having been proposed by the convention of burghs, on 6th July, 1711, to add £1 10s. to the proportion of the tax roll payable by Glasgow, to help in making up the £10 allocated on but not paid by the burghs of barony and

¹ Convention Records, IV., pp. 464-5.

³ *Anaea*, p. 141.

² Municipal Corporations Report, II., p. 335. ⁴ Report of Historical MSS. Commission (Earl of Mar and Kellie, 1904), p. 398.

⁵ Caledonia, III., p. 810. Municipal Corporations Report, II., p. 335.

In 1714 Greenock was declared to be a public port, and officers of the customs from Port-Glasgow were ordered to reside in Greenock for the "ease of trade" and the collection of the revenue (Williamson's Old Greenock, p. 138).

⁶ Campbell's Historical Sketches of Greenock, I., pp. 65-6.

In his "History of Old Greenock" Williamson states that the two quays were finished in 1734. The breasts connecting the quays were not built till 1764 (pp. 26, 27).

⁷ Glasgow Records, IV., pp. 478-9.

regality, the commissioner for the burgh submitted a series of reasons why this addition should not be made. These, as further illustrating the conditions of the city in 1711, are interesting—

(1) It is to be considered (he said) that the town had no courts of judicature to occasione the resort of strangers, numbers of inhabitants, consumption of goods, and other advantages by which cities are supported in their riches and trade, but the toun depends almost entirely upon the trade to the plantations, which how uncertain and precarious it is in time of war everybody knows, and how particularly it has been so to Glasgow cannot escape the observatione of all who have been any wise acquainted with that place since the Union.

(2) The losses of that town by trade have been so palpable and so considerable that it can to a demonstration be made appear, upon a reasonable estimate of the incomes and losses by trade, that the latter has exceeded the former above thirty thousand pounds sterlinc the three years last past.

(3) That when the tax roll was altered six years ago the town's proportion was advanced £4 16s., an unsupportable burden under which they have ever since groaned.

(4) Not only upon these considerations had the town of Glasgow ground to expect ane ease of their burden from the convention, but likewise upon account of the great loss they have met with this year, the loss of four of their West India ships within these few days, the too just fears of the loss of more of them, that they were under no apprehensions of having any further burden laid upon them, much less could they have expected that the convention should have proceeded in such an irregular and precipitant method, and imposed a scheme without consulting the town of Glasgow and the other burghs so much concerned.

(5) Not only has the town of Glasgow these losses, but this and the two former years have been extraordinary, but even the ships which have arrived and are so much talked of have been for the most part loaden with tobacco, which commoditie since the Union has been so great a drugg that it rather has brought loss than profit to the importers. As for red wine and other goods by which any advantage has accrued to the merchant, our importations of them have been so very inconsiderable that they can never be a reasone for laying a greater burden.

(6) A great deal of forreign trade, and almost all the fishing of the West Seas, reputed to be in the toun of Glasgow, has been and is managed by the toun of Greenock and other places, not to mention the removall of several of our chief merchants from Glasgow to other places, where they can be easier in their stent, and the vast charge and expense which the toun of Glasgow is now obliged to be at in repairing and cleansing of their harbour at Port-Glasgow, to prevent their ships being obliged to go to other ports.

From all these reasons and a great many others which might be offered, it is evident (concludes the lachrymose commissioner) that the not lessening the toun of Glasgow's proportione of the tax roll, much more the charging them with any more than according to their proportion of the deficiency of the unfree traders, must inevitably bring ruin and destruction upon that toun.¹

These reasons are very much based upon the impoverished condition of the town, as disclosed by the reports of the commissioners in 1692. Much dispute, into which it is needless to enter here, took place in subsequent years as to the proportion to be paid by Glasgow, Aberdeen, Renfrew, and other burghs. An amicable settlement was, however, arrived at in the convention of 16th July, 1714. In the tax roll adjusted on 22nd November of that year, the proportion (applicable to £98) of

¹ Convention Records, V., pp. 7-9; Glasgow Records, IV., p. 461.

Edinburgh was £40; while that of Glasgow was £16 14s.; that of Rutherglen was 5s.; Irvine, 12s.; Rothesay, 4s.; and Dumbarton and Renfrew, each 6s.¹

Between 1666 and 1716 little appears to have been done to improve the channel of the river, and floods of an ordinary kind frequently happened. But in 1712 a great flood arose, 18 feet 6 inches above the ordinary tide, and did much injury to the lower parts of the town. It is described by James Duncan, bookseller, who witnessed it.² In 1716 an act of parliament³ authorised a continuation, till 1st November, 1738, of an imposition of two pennies Scots, or one-sixth of a penny sterling, on every pint of ale and beer sold within the city and its privileges, which imposition had been sanctioned by an act of the Scottish parliament in 1693, and had been continued till 1722 by another act in 1705. The act of 1715 sets forth in its preamble the grounds on which the extension was allowed. It states (1) that the city was imminent by situation and usefulness in trade and manufactures, but was yet more considerable for its loyalty and zeal for the reformed religion, constitution, and liberty of the people, whereof, on all proper occasions, it had given undeniable proofs, more particularly by furnishing, at the charge of the inhabitants, considerable numbers of men, well armed and disciplined, not only for defence of the city, but even for the support and defence of the government in other places since the Revolution, on divers very remarkable occasions, and lately in a most cordial and cheerful manner in opposition to the "Pretender;" and (2) that the yearly revenues or common good of the city were scarcely sufficient to meet the annual necessary charges of its government, much less for payment of the debts of the corporation, which had lately been greatly increased by very considerable sums having been laid out for furnishing a battalion of foot to serve at Stirling, and for putting the citizens into a posture of defence against the rebels. This act, moreover, declared that, as the building of a quay on the Clyde at the city, from the Broomielaw to the Ducket Green, would greatly improve the navigation of the river, and be a conveniency in loading and unloading goods, the magistrates should, for the building of the quay, advance out of the money to be raised by the impost such sums as might be judged necessary by the merchants' house and trades' house of the city.

On 31st July, 1708, the town council of Glasgow, on a representation by many of the merchants concerned in foreign salt and export of herrings, &c., appointed George Johnston, in Port-Glasgow, to inspect all herrings exported out of the precinct of Port-Glasgow, try the sufficiency of their curing and packing, and affix his burning mark on the casks wherein the herrings were sufficiently cured and packed, all in conformity with the act of parliament "anent loyall cureing and packing of herrings and salmond fish," dated 12th May, 1693.⁴ On

¹ Convention Records, V., pp. 139-40.

³ 2 George I., c. 44. Glasgow Records, IV.,

² MacGeorge's Old Glasgow, p. 255.

pp. 677-9.

Cleland's Annals, p. 31.

⁴ Glasgow Records, IV., p. 429.

the decease of Johnston, Robert Snyp, then cooper in Renfrew, but who was thereafter to reside in Port-Glasgow, was appointed to the office on 1st October, 1714;¹ and on the same day the provost reported that several merchants had met the feuars and masters of vessels at Port-Glasgow, and agreed upon the following rules for the mooring of ships and barques:—

(1) That all ships comeing from sea should not lye above five days at the end of the key, and that they shall keep fifty foot from the end of the key, that all ships and smal veshells may have free passage, under the penalty of twenty shilling Scots each day, and the like penalty if they doe not keep the distance.

(2) That no anchors be laid within the harbour betuixt the far end of the key and Captain Lyons weir, under the pain of three pound Scots for each transgression, and their buoy ropes not above twelve or fourteen foot long on anchors that lys towards the bay, under the penalty of three pounds Scots for each transgression.

(3) That all ships moar east and west by the side of the key, and each be helpfull to another, that anchors may lye in the harbour.

(4) That all ships that are livered immediately haill out of the way, to give place to ships that are to liver.

(5) That no barks, gabarts or boats shall moar or lye at the cran or stair, except they be either loading or livering, but remove to a convenient place out of the way and be admitted in course to liver.

(6) That no ships or barks lye within the harbour, as wreck ships, not being employed in trade, above three months, but must remove to a convenient place out of the way.

The town council approved of these rules, and commissioned John Lyon, skipper in Port-Glasgow to be shoremaster, and see they were duly observed.²

On 25th March, 1712, the late provost of Glasgow and the dean of guild reported that they had inspected the harbour and quay of Port-Glasgow, and had entered into an agreement with John Hunter, mason, there, “for raising the key from the far end of the same by raising it an eln at the beginning, and so on as far as is needfull.”³

Having considered that certain anchorage dues were exacted at the harbours of Greenock, Crawfordsdyke, and Gourock, and it being but just and reasonable that the vessels, boats, and others belonging to these places should pay the like anchorage dues at Port-Glasgow harbour as were exacted at these respective harbours off vessels and boats belonging to Glasgow and Port-Glasgow, the town council, on 27th May, 1712, appointed James Couper, in Port-Glasgow, to be shoresman, and directed him to exact such dues accordingly.⁴

On 23rd July, 1712, the convention of burghs appointed the commissioners for Inveraray and Campbeltown to visit Rothesay, and report to the next convention.⁵ On 9th July, 1714, an informal report as to the condition of the burgh having been presented to the convention, the visitors formerly appointed were directed to bring in a report to the next convention.⁶

¹ Glasgow Records, IV., p. 524.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 475-6.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 524-5.

⁵ Convention Records, V., p. 64.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 474.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

On 9th July, 1715, the convention allowed Rothesay £100 Scots towards the reparation of its harbour and bridge.¹

On 8th July, 1728, in consequence of a petition to the convention from Rothesay, a committee was appointed to visit the burgh, and report its case and condition, its trade, public works, and common good.² On their report, the convention, on 10th July, 1730, allowed the burgh £100 Scots.³

It appears that the rules and regulations adopted on 1st October, 1714, had not taken effect, and that the shoremaster then appointed had not accepted office. In accordance therefore, with the recommendations of a committee appointed on 28th March, 1718,⁴ the town council on 29th April passed the following amended and enlarged rules and regulations for the accommodation of vessels at Port-Glasgow, with relative tables of dues:—

RULES for the accommodation of vessels in Portglasgow to be observed and put in execution by the shoremaster.

1. That all ships coming from sea shall nocht lye above five days at the end of the key, and that they shall keep fifty foot from the end of the key, that all ships and small vessels may have free passage at the key end, under the penalty of fourty shilling Scots for each day and the penalty of six pund Scots if they do nocht keep the distance.

2. That no anchor be laid within the harbour, commencing between the fifty foot from the far end of the key and captain Lyons weer, under the penalty of three pund Scots for each transgression, attour performance, and their buy ropes nocht to be above twelve or fourtein [foot] long on anchors that lyes towards [the] bay, under the penalty of one pund Scots each transgression, besides that the buy ropes bended at a longer reatch are to be cutt by the shoarmaster.

3. That all ships moar east and west by the syde of the key and each be helpfull to another, that no anchores may lye in the harbour.

4. That all ships that are livered imediately hale out of the way to give place to ships that are to liver, and all ships coming into the harbour laded are to be preferred to the best births, and if any light ship refuse to give the place to loaden ships from abroad the shoremaster is to compell, by cutting their fasts, and all ships taking in ladeings are to have the nixt birth, and these longest in the harbour to lye furthest off the key or breast.

5. That no boats, barks or gabarts moar or lye at the cran or stairs except they be either loading or livering, but remove out of the way, and be admitted in course to liver or load, &c., under the penalty of three pund Scots *toties quoties*.

6. That no ships, barks, gabarts, boats, or other vessells whatsoever, lye within the harbor as wreck vessells, not being employed in trade, above four moneths, and after that time the owners shall be obligt to carry them out of the harbour to a convenient place, at the sight of the baillie and shoremaster, and in case of refusal or delay in the owners or caretakers of the said vessells, after eight days advertisement by the shoremaster, the baillie and he is to cause carry them out upon the expenss of the said owners without being lyable for any damages to be sustained thereby.

7. That no ships, barks or boats are to cast out any ballast or dirt within the harbour at any time, nor to laden ballast but in the day time, without liberty of the baillie, and in taking in or out are allways to have a cloath spread over the ship syde in to the boat or

¹ Convention Records, V., p. 148.

² *Ibid.*, p. 508.

² *Ibid.*, p. 480.

⁴ MS. Council Register, XIX., p. 529.

gabart, that no part of said ballast fall into the harbour, under the penalty of twelve pund Scots *toties quoties*. That no ballast stone or sand or otheris be laid upon the shoar, within the bounds of the harbour or bay of Newark, but shall be carried to a convenient distance without the harbour down the river, where the baillie shall appoynt, and there as near the shore as the boat that carries it can go at full sea, under the penalty of six pund *toties quoties*; and if any vessel put out stone ballast, with a resolution to take it on board again with convenience, the master is first to obtain liberty of the baillie, who is to appoynt a place where it is to be laid, and if the master takes it nocth aboard again in a reasonable time the baillie and shoremaster is to cause him, on his own expenss, to remove it to the place where other ballast is laid, without the harbour downward the river, and if he refuse the baillie is to arrest his ship till he find caution or consign money in the baillies hand for carrying it away as said is, and to fine him for contumacy.

8. That no goods and merchandizes, except when livering or loading, do nocth lye on the key or breast if there is room in the closs or cellars.

9. That if any vessells laid to the breast, key or shore, for livering or loading, shall not make dispatch and dilligence, but delay to the prejudice of other vessells ready to comence for livering or loading as said is, they shall be appoynted to remove and give place to the others, as the shoremaster shall find expedient; and if, by reason of severall vessellis livering or loading at once, there be nocth gabarts, lighters or boats sufficient to serve all, these lighters are to be divided equally, at the discretion of the baillie and shoremaster, notwithstanding of any paction or aggreement made by any of the parties.

10. Whoever hes occasion to break ground on the graveing bank or elsewhere in the bay shall be obliged to fill it up and make it smooth again, at the sight of the shoremaster, under the penalty of five pund Scots.

11. That no timber, plank or sticks, old or new, or any kind of lumber whatsoeuer, lye upon the breast or key above twenty four hours, but shall be carried to the proper places appoynted for them, and if the owners or caretakers of the said timber do nocth carry away the same, when advertised, is to be fyned in three pund Scots *toties quoties*, and the shoremaster to cause carry away the same on the owners charge and poynd a part of the timber for the fine. And all guns are to be laid near together in convenient places and nocth to lye scattered up and down.

That the baillie give his concurrence and assistance to the shoremaster in seeing the above rules performed and observed, and that all the fynes and penaltys abovementioned be levied and uplifted by the baillie and applyd for cleansing the harbour, except the fynes and penaltys in the last elevent article, quwhich is to be appropriat to the touns oficer of Portglasgow.

ANCHORAGES and DEWS to be uplifted at Portglasgow of all vessels, at every voyage or time, comes within the harbour or to the road, to be exacted by the shoremaster as a fund for his encouragement to exerce his office.

A ship with two round tops, at every coming in to the harbour of Portglasgow, pay one pund sixteen shilling Scots.

A ship with one round top pay one pund.

A bark with two topsaillis pay eighteen shillings.

A bark with one topsaill pay twelve shillings.

A bark with two jurey masts, with a whole deck, pay eight shillings.

A gabart or bark, or others with one jurey mast, pay three shillings.

A fisher boat, with fast strakes and cock boat, pay three shillings.

A fisher boat, without streaks, pay two shillings.

A scout or yoll pay one shilling.

Every herring boat, fisher or maker, when the herring is taken within the poynt of the Barrow, only pay four shillings during the whole fishing.

A doggar or brigantine, for each time in the harbour or road of Portglasgow, pay one pound.

Every boat or gabart with coalls, having above thirty barrells on board, shall pay one barrel of coallis; and any quantity on board under thirty barrellis as aforsaid shall pay two pennies Scots per barrell, as hes bein use and wont, for the measure barrell, quhich is hereafter to be marked with the dean of gilds seal; and no measure barrells to be kept at the port but by the shoremaster allenerly, under the penalty of twelve pund Scots. He is also to keep the measure barrelli for Highland beef, and the fee for each barrell two shilling Scots.

Every vessell with victuall, coming from the north of Scotland or without the river of Clyde, to pay two pecks of each one hundreded barrellis out of what they have on board, and that for the use of the weights and measures. It is to be understood that vessellis coming to the road of Portglasgow, and nocth going within the harbour to liver or load, pays the same anchorage, but tho' beef both in the harbour and road for livering or loading the same cargo, yet is nocth to pay twice.

All which anchorages, and fee for coall and victuall measures, to be applyd as a sallary or fund to the shoremaster for his pains and attendance to see the above rules observed, who is to keep a book with exact accompts of anchorages payd and of the time of every vessells coming in and going out of the harbour, and if any damages happens through the neglect of the shoremaster his not observing of the foregoing rules he is to be lyable to make good the same.

It is to be remarked that the ships or vessels, great or small, of all sorts, belonging to Greenock, Gourock or Crawfords dyck, are to pay as formerly so much as these places exact of Glasgow and Portglasgow vessellis, and to be uplifted by the tacksmen of the touns great lodging and closs in Portglasgow, conform to their tack, and the shoarmaster to have no benefit therof.

DUES of the Touns Officer of Portglasgow.

That all boats or vessels following who sell their cargo at Portglasgow shall pay as follows, viz. :—

Every cowpar herring boat free (that is) belonging to Glasgow or Portglasgow pay three east herring, and strangers the double.

Every fisher boat with nets a quarter hundreded herring, and strangers the double.

Every killen boat, one killen and a codfish, and strangers the double.

Every cockle and mussle boat a peck each boat, and each oyster boat ane hundreded, and strangers the double.

Every beat with potatos one peck, and strangers the double.

But the yollis of Portglasgow going out in the river to fish pay nothing.

That the officer keep accompt of what Yule wages he receivs and from whom that the magistrats of Glasgow may see who pays and who nocth to support him.

That the baillie of Portglasgow command that the street and lanes be kept clean of all dirt and middens, quhich if nocth removed within twenty four houris, after advertisement given by the officer, then the officer is to dispose of the said muck to himself and for his own use, and the contraveeners to pay twelve shillings of fine *toties quoties* to the officer, and the baillie to grant his concurrence to the officer for levying therof.

On the further recommendation of the committee and of the feuars and others, the town council appointed James Riddell, sailor in Port-Glasgow, to be shore-

master, with full authority to enforce the regulations and collect the dues; and the town officer of Port-Glasgow was directed to observe the orders of the bailie and shoremaster.¹

While the Union with England was very unpopular with the burghs of Scotland, it opened up the colonies to Scottish commerce, and, availing themselves of this, the merchants of Glasgow engaged in an extensive and lucrative trade with Virginia and Maryland. For a time they had to carry on their operations in English ships, but by-and-by they became shipowners. In 1716 a vessel of 60 tons burden was built at Crawford's dyke, and was the first ship sent from the Clyde to Virginia. This was in 1718, and formed the commencement of a tobacco trade which gave to the Glasgow importers the title of "tobacco lords." But this state of growing trade aroused the jealousy of the tobacco merchants of England, who complained to the lords of the treasury of the fraudulent manner in which the Glasgow merchants conducted the trade. On 10th January, 1723, the lord provost of Edinburgh acquainted the committee of convention that he had received a letter from the magistrates of Glasgow signifying that the merchants of London, Bristol, and other towns in England were attempting to deprive Scotland of the tobacco trade, and requesting that endeavours be made to prevent such attempts on so valuable a branch of trade. A remit was accordingly made to a sub-committee, consisting of Edinburgh, Stirling, Glasgow, Kirkcaldy, Renfrew, Sanquhar, Inveraray, and Campbeltown, to consider the letter and every other thing remitted to the committee by the convention in July last, and to report.² On the following day a petition to parliament on the subject was adopted, and ordered to be transmitted to the members of parliament for the burghs for their concurrence.³ After full enquiry the complaints of the English merchants were dismissed as groundless, and as "having proceeded from a spirit of envy, and not from a regard to the interest of trade or of the King's revenue." A subsequent appeal to the House of Commons, however, and proceedings in the Court of Exchequer, resulted in the establishment of restrictions on the Glasgow trade which severely crippled it.⁴

On 9th July, 1720, the convention appointed a committee to visit Irvine and report as to its condition.⁵

On 8th May, 1722, the town council of Glasgow resolved to proceed with the

¹ MS. Council Register, XIX., pp. 534-40. ² Convention Records, V., p. 325. ³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Gibson's History of Glasgow (pp. 206-9). Gibson gives a list of the ships of various kinds which belonged to the Clyde in 1735. It gives 15 as trading to Virginia; 4 to Jamaica; 2 to Antigua; 2 to St. Kitts; 6 to London; 3 to Boston; 4 to the Straits; 1 to Gibraltar; 1 to Barbadoes; 2 to Holland; 7 to Stockholm; and 20 as engaged in trade on the river, to Ireland, and on the coast. But he adds that the whole shipping on the Clyde did not then exceed 5,600 tons (*Ibid.*, pp. 210-11).

⁵ Convention Records, V., p. 236. On 10th July, 1723, the burgh was allowed £8 on account of its decaying trade and heavy proportion of the tax roll (*Ibid.*, p. 334).

construction of the quay authorised by the act of 1716, and directed the scheme to be submitted to the merchants' house and trades' house in order to their fixing the amount to be expended on the work.¹ On 22nd June, accordingly, the provost reported to the town council that he and other magistrates had represented the matter both to the merchants' house and trades' house, but that the former had made no reply. The trades' house had, however, on 26th May, expressed its consent to £10,000 Scots [£833 6s. 8d. sterling] being expended on the work, and would be prepared to sanction such further expenditure as might be necessary. The magistrates were instructed to bring the matter again under the consideration of the merchants' house, but the result does not appear. The construction of the quay was, however, gone on with, and the town council directed it to be carried "from the old key to St. Tennochis burn foot opposite to the Dowcat Green," giving special instructions as to the size and quality of the stones to be got from the town's quarries.² On 30th September, 1723, the treasurer of the city reported that payments on account of the work had been made from time to time to the amount of £10,548 18s. 8d. Scots [£879 1s. 6d. sterling].³ Many other payments on account of the work were subsequently made.

In a statement of the town's charges on public works as at 12th November, 1724, the cost of "the building of the Bromilaw key, and filling with redd, and of timber for the front," is stated at 30,000 merks; and it is mentioned that £2,000 Scots would be required to complete the work.⁴ These two sums amount to £1,833 6s. 6d. sterling. M'Ure states with reference to the Broomielaw harbour that—"There is not such a fresh water harbour to be seen in any place in Britain; it is strangely fenced with beams of oak, fastened with iron batts within the wall thereof, that the great boards of ice in time of thaw may not offend it; and it is so large that a regiment of horse may be exercised thereupon."⁵

On 2nd July, 1729, Glasgow petitioned the convention to give it relief. Its petition set forth the low state of the burgh, and craved authority to feu the lands and barony of Provan or any part of their commonalty to the best advantage, for the purposes therein mentioned, and also to give it such farther relief as the convention thought proper. The authority sought was granted on the following day,

¹ MS. Council Records, XX., p. 507.

* M'Ure's History of Glasgow (first pub-

² *Ibid.*, XX., pp. 521, 526.

lished in 1736), 1830 edition, p. 231;

³ *Ibid.*, XXI., p. 76.

Appendix, p. 347.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 231. In the tax roll levied by the Convention of Burghs on 9th July, 1718, and 14th July, 1726, the proportion of Edinburgh was £36, and that of Glasgow, £18 10s.; in that levied on 8th July, 1728, the proportion of Edinburgh was £34 10s., and of Glasgow, £19 10s. Notwithstanding the complaints made by the commissioner of Glasgow in 1711, however, and the smallness of the increases subsequently made by the convention on its tax roll on the city during the seventeen subsequent years, it may be noticed that Defoe, travelling in Scotland in 1726, described Glasgow as "the emporium of the West of Scotland, being for its commerce and riches the second in the northern part of Great Britain."

and a committee was appointed to visit the burgh, and report as to its trade and common good.¹ On 2nd July, 1736, the town council remitted to the dean of guild to order the cleansing of the quay at Broomielaw, and appointed a committee to inspect the sand banks and fords in the river, and expend a sum not exceeding £20 sterling on an experiment in clearing it.² What the result of that experiment was does not appear. But in 1740 Glasgow seems to have been wakening up to the importance of improving the channel of the river. The magistrates were accordingly empowered to expend £100 sterling in deepening it below the Broomielaw, and in building "a flat-bottomed boat to carry off the sand and shingle from the banks."³

In his view of Glasgow, published in 1736, M'Ure gives (1) a list of the linen and woollen drapers, commonly called English merchants, since 1600, and (2) a list of the sea adventurers trading to sundry places in Europe, Africa, and America since the year 1668.⁴

The trade with America, which previous to 1740 had been largely conducted by barter, was subsequently conducted to a great extent on systems of credit. The competition, pushed by resident British factors, became acute, and the business largely speculative and less profitable. Gibson gives an abstract of the imports and exports of Glasgow, Greenock, and Port-Glasgow for the year 1772, which shows the rapidly developing and widening trade of the city at the time.⁵ He

¹ Convention Records, V., p. 490.

³ MS. Council Record, XXIV., p. 198.

² MS. Council Record, XXIII., p. 348.

At this time the population of the city was 17,043—an increase of 3,211 since 1712. In 1743 it was 18,366, and in 1757 it (including that of the suburbs) had grown to 25,546—an increase in fifteen years of upwards of 7,000.

⁴ Of the latter he states that the merchant adventurers who succeeded in sea trading were John Young, merchant, Matthew Turnbull, Archibald Faulds, and William Symer; and thereafter the great projector of trade was William Simpson, born at St. Andrews about one hundred years ago. He built two ships at the Bremmylaw, and brought them down the river the time of a great flood. The place of our shipping in these days was the bailliary of Cunningham and the sheriffdom of Ayr. He traded to Flanders, Poland, France, and Dantzig, and built great houses in Glasgow. In the list of sea adventurers he mentions Walter Gibson. His first appearance was in maltmaking, and his stock being improved that way he left that trade and betook himself to merchandising, beginning first with the herring fishing. Freighting a Dutch ship, called the "St. Agat," of 450 tons burden, with herrings packed and cured, he took it to St. Martins in France, and brought it back laden with salt and brandy. The result of this was so great that he purchased the ship and two others, with which he traded to France, Spain, Norway, Sweden, and Virginia. He was the first who brought iron to Glasgow. Previously the shopkeepers bought it with dyeing stuff from Stirling and Borrowtounness. Before that time, six citizens, owners of the ship "Providence," first imported "cherry sack" to Glasgow, and the retailers bought what they required from the merchants of Edinburgh and Leith (M'Ure, pp. 165-70).

⁵ History of Glasgow, pp. 213-34. "The share of the imports and exports of Greenock and Port-Glasgow," he says, "is very trifling."

explains, however, (1) that several cargoes from North America and the West Indies, belonging to Glasgow, were delivered in London, and very great quantities of wheat were sent from North America to the southern parts of Europe on account of the merchants of Glasgow, and (2) that very large quantities of goods were exported annually from London and other ports in England on account of the people in Glasgow. The particular imports and exports of the port of Glasgow given by him fall, therefore, very far short of the real imports and exports of the property of the city. The shipping of the Clyde at that time, he states, was above 60,000 tons.¹

In December, 1724, the feuars of Port-Glasgow undertook to grind, at mills erected by the town council of Glasgow, the whole malt, to be brewed by them and their tenants at Port-Glasgow, and to pay 16s. Scots for each boll to be so ground or to be grown by them and their tenants, on condition that the proceeds should be applied towards defraying the expense of "enlarging and fortifying the harbour and key and drawing out another head thereto, and building of a dry dock and erecting the saids milnes, and charges of collecting the said duty and manageing the saids milnes." This bond of thirlage was accepted by the town council on 30th March, 1725, two steel mills were erected, and on 29th April managers and overseers of the fund were appointed.² Seven years later the council minutes refer to "the building of Port-Glasgow key" as in progress, and on 3rd January, 1733, "John Watt, mathematician," was authorised to be paid "fifteen guineas for drawing two plans of Port-Glasgow."³ These plans may have been required in connection with the works at the quay, and also with the adjustment of boundaries between the town and Sir James Hamilton of Rosshall, about which there are some references in the minutes.⁴ John Watt, who was uncle of James Watt, prepared, in 1734, a map of the river Clyde, which was published in 1759.⁵

On 8th July, 1728, on a petition from Rothesay, the convention appointed a committee to visit the burgh, and "report the case and condition thereof, and of their trade, public works and common good."⁶ On 10th July, 1730, the convention, on the report of that committee, allowed Rothesay £100 Scots.⁷

On 5th January, 1731, the convention consulted the lord advocate as to certain questions regarding unfree burghs and the communication of trade, and gave instructions with the view of preserving and protecting the privileges of free burghs.⁸

¹ History of Glasgow, p. 235.

³ *Ibid.*, XXII., pp. 528, 532.

² MS. Council Register, XXI., p. 229.

⁴ *Ibid.*, XXIII., pp. 48, 254.

⁵ Mr. George Williamson, in his "Memorials of James Watt," published in 1856 (pp. 53-57), gives the map along with an interesting account of its preparation and publication. The plan is here reproduced on a lesser scale.

⁶ Convention Records, V., p. 480.

⁸ *Ibid.*, V., pp. 514-9.

⁷ *Ibid.*, V., p. 508.

On 8th July, 1731, the convention allowed Dumbarton £20 sterling to help to defray expenses of law suits.¹

On 2nd July, 1736, the town council of Glasgow appointed a committee to inspect "the sand banks or foords on the river below the Broomilaw," and authorised a sum not exceeding £20 sterling to be expended "for an experiment upon one of the sand banks for clearing the river."²

Reference has already been made to the property at the east end of Greenock, known as the Royal Fishery Closs, acquired by the town council of Glasgow about the year 1684.³ In 1739, when the tack then current was about to expire, the feuars of Greenock applied for and obtained a nineteen years' lease of the premises, with permission to fit up the lofts for a meeting-house. Subsequently the tacksman represented that the want of cellars in Greenock for accommodating Glasgow merchants was attended with great inconvenience, and that they were willing to build cellars able to contain from 800 to 1,000 hogsheads, if their tack was prolonged for two periods of nineteen years each after the expiry of the nineteen years then current. This was agreed to, and the prolonged tack was subscribed on 30th September, 1742. The property was thus let for 57 years from Whitsunday, 1739, at the yearly rent of £10 sterling.⁴

Under the energetic and influential guidance of Sir John Shaw, Greenock was making important progress.⁵ Not only had the advances which he had made in connection with the harbour been repaid him, under the administration of the officials appointed by him, but in 1740 a clear surplus of 27,000 merks Scots, or £1,500 sterling, was obtained. On 30th January, 1741, he granted to his feuars and the sub-feuars a charter by which he empowered them to choose annually nine managers of a voluntary assessment imposed by

¹ Convention Records, V., p. 525.

³ *Antea*, pp. 110-1.

² MS. Council Register, XXIII., p. 345.

⁴ MS. Council Register, XXIV., pp. 69, 90, 309, 468. On the expiry of this tack "the cellars and other subjects in the Royal Closs at Greenock" were set to the collector and comptroller of His Majesty's Customs at Port-Glasgow for five years from Whitsunday, 1797, at the yearly rental of £200 sterling (*Ibid.*, XXXVII., pp. 440-1). After having been possessed by the Commissioners of Customs for that period, the property was, in November, 1801, set to Robert Ewing, merchant in Greenock, for other five years, at the yearly rent of £380 sterling (*Ibid.*, XL., p. 123). In 1807 it was exposed for sale at the upset priece of one guinea per square yard, but there being no offerer, a committee was authorised to sell by private bargain for whatever priece could be procured. Shortly afterwards the property, or rather the sub-tack of the property, for the town only held it on long lease, was sold to Messrs. Ewing and Robertson of Greenock, at the price of £3,200 sterling (*Ibid.*, XLII., p. 619; XLIV., p. 221).

⁵ By 1740 the population of the town was 2,983. The gross receipts of customs at its port for 1728 amounted to £15,231 4s. 4½d.; and for 1745 to £15,831 3s. 9½d.

Weir's "History of Greenock," p. 42. Williamson's "Old Greenock," p. 75.

themselves on all malt ground by them at his mills of West Greenock. But he declared that the powers thus conferred should not prejudice the jurisdiction competent to him and his heirs as barons of the town and barony under the charter of Charles II. in 1670. Sir John's charter of 1741 was the beginning of a self-government which was to develop. In March, 1751, an act of parliament (24 George II.) authorised the imposition of a voluntary assessment of two pennies Scots on each pint of ale brewed in the town, to be applied in deepening and repairing the harbour, and in building a new church, town house, and market, and for other purposes, and appointed nine townsmen to be trustees of the funds thus raised, with power to nominate their successors.¹ This act, commencing on 1st June, 1751, endured for thirty-one years.

On 15th January, 1748, a contract was entered into between the magistrates of Irvine and Thomas Brown, mason, for removing the old bridge of Irvine and building a new bridge on its site, of the same number of arches and pillars as the old bridge. For that work the town council became bound to pay Brown £350 sterling for building the bridge, including all the materials. On 21st April, 1753, Brown acknowledged having received payment of the contract price of the work, and discharged the magistrates and council thereof.²

On 2nd June, 1733, a great fire in Paisley consumed Saint Mirren's Wynd and much adjoining property, and, upon the site of the wynd and property adjoining, a higher class of houses than had previously existed was erected.³ This led the inhabitants of the town to promote other improvements. In 1736 the magistrates and council acquired all the rights which then remained in the family of Dundonald in Paisley, and upon its title to these the Municipal Commissioners of 1835 say the rights and privileges of the burgh continued to rest till 1832.⁴ In 1753 the town obtained an act of parliament⁵ "for improving the navigation of the river Cart and for other purposes." The preamble sets forth that the town carried on a considerable trade in the manufacture of thread and linen cloth, and is situated on the river Cart, which falls into the Clyde about four miles below Glasgow, which river Cart, by reason of the banks, stones, and rocks therein, is scarcely navigable to the town of Paisley, except at the highest spring tides; and the making of the navigation of the river practicable and commodious at all times would be a great advantage to the town. It, therefore, enacted that, from and after 24th June, 1753, for thirty-one years, an imposition of two pennies Scots should be leviable on every Scots pint of ale and beer brewed, brought into, or sold within the town or its liberties, to be applied, *inter alia*, in making the river navigable. The

¹ Municipal Corporations Report, II., p. 57. ³ Brown's History of Paisley, I., p. 399.

² Muniments of Irvine, II., pp. 137-9.

⁴ Municipal Corporations Report, II., p. 283.

In 1739 the population of Paisley is said to have been about 3,396 (Brown's History of Paisley, I., p. 376).

⁵ 26 George II., cap. 96. Saint Mirrin, by David Semple (1872), pp. 174-9.

population of the town at the commencement of the act in 1753 was 4,195, and at its expiry in 1784 the population was 17,560. During the period of thirty-one years £2,500 was levied, being an average of £80 yearly. Of the expenditure, amounting to £2,674 3s. 7d., only £86 6s. 11d. appears to have expended in laying out and deepening the river.¹

On 10th April, 1751, Sir John Shaw executed a second charter, by which, referring to the great increase of the burgh, he empowered the feuars to appoint twelve of their number to be magistrates and councillors; merchants and tradesmen to be free burgesses, each paying not more than 30 merks (£1 13s. 4d. sterling) for admission. But, though registered for preservation in the books of council and session on 12th April, it was never acted upon.² On 22nd September, in the same year, Sir John,³ as baron of the barony and burgh, on the narrative that by the great increase of the town and barony it had become necessary that its police and government should be put under proper regulations, and that there should be a perpetual succession of burgesses chosen, with bailies, treasurer, clerk, and officers, for the constant management of the funds or common good and the administration of the affairs of the town, granted full power and commission to all the feuars and sub-feuars to meet and elect the nine townsmen above referred to, to be magistrates and councillors of the burgh —two to be bailies, one treasurer, and the other six to be councillors, with all the powers therein specified, including the administration of the harbour.⁴ The municipal government of the town, therefore, continued to be administered under the second charter of 1751 till the Burgh Reform Act 3 and 4 Will. IV., c. 77, came into operation. The only difference between the two charters is in the number of councillors and the day of their election. On the second Monday of September, 1751, the first magistrates and councillors were elected. But it was

¹ It is stated by Mr. Semple, that though the principal object of the act was the deepening of the river, only one year's revenue of the impost was applied to that object. (Saint Mirin, p. 179). He adds that "the town council even allowed the representatives of Glasgow to erect two dykes or jettées near the mouth of the Cart, which obstructed the tidal flow up the Cart, and directed it up the Clyde. The council demanded damages, and accepted of £150 in compensation for the injury done to their river; but they did not expend a single shilling of that money on the improvement of Cart navigation." (*Ibid.*)

² Williamson's "Old Greenock," pp. 86-7.

³ This Sir John, the third and last Sir John Shaw of Greenock, died in 1752. During his lifetime he is said to have maintained his feudal jurisdiction with great strictness. On the occasion of proclaiming fairs and similar occasions he used to cause the banner which had been borne by his grandfather at Worcester to be carried before him and his feudal bailies, and the heads of the trades, while perambulating the town of Greenock (*Glasgow Herald*, 11th July, 1900).

⁴ Williamson's "Old Greenock," p. 87.

found by the Court of Session on 27th May, 1794, that these magistrates had no higher jurisdiction than that of ordinary baron bailies.¹

¹ In virtue of this charter the magistrates occasionally exercised the jurisdiction reserved to independent burghs of barony by the Statute 20 George II., c. 48. But the sheriff-clerk of Renfrewshire, finding that this diminished his emoluments by preventing many of the lawsuits arising in the burgh from coming before the sheriff court, brought an action of declarator, concluding that they had no higher jurisdiction than that of ordinary baron bailies. The question came to be whether the burgh was independent of the baron in the sense of the Jurisdiction Act? The court found, on 27th May, 1794, that it was not, as no deed of the baron subsequent to the statute rendering the burgh independent of him could confer jurisdiction. Thereafter, accordingly, the magistrates of Greenock exercised only the limited powers continued by the Jurisdiction Act to baron courts. (*Municipal Corporations Report, II.*, pp. 57, 58.)

IX.

FROM THE MIDDLE TILL THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, 1751-1800.

The increase of the shipping on the Clyde in 1754-5 necessitated the erection of a lighthouse on the south-west end of Little Cumray. An act of parliament was therefore obtained,¹ empowering the Earl of Eglintown to feu out two acres of land in the south - west end of Little Cumray as a site for a lighthouse and a wharf at which to land coals to be burned in it. The feu contract was appointed to be taken in favour of Lord Eglintown, Lord Cathcart, and John Stewart Shaw, of Greenock, and their respective heirs male, the provost, bailies, dean of guild, and convener of the city of Glasgow; the provost, bailies, dean of guild, and convener of the city who held these offices immediately before the existing holders; the two bailies of the town of Greenock; and the bailie of Port-Glasgow—these several persons being, by the act, appointed commissioners or trustees for executing it. After the lighthouse was erected, the commissioners were authorised to levy tonnage dues from all vessels passing it; and they were empowered to borrow £500 on the security of the dues to meet the expenses of the act and the several works. The trustees were also empowered to remove shoals and flats in the Firth of Clyde, and to erect such beacons, buoys, and land or sea marks on any places in the firth as would render the navigation more safe and commodious.

When the lighthouse was established it was supplied by a fire light, but that was found to be unsuitable, and in 1785 lighting by candles was proposed. In 1793 a new lighthouse was erected on the west side of the island, and appears to have been lighted for the first time on 1st October of that year; but notice was given that the old lighthouse was to be continued till it was seen how the new one succeeded. It was lighted with thirty-two oil lamps, having reflectors of silvered glass. Thirty-three years later, however (1826), the lighthouse was constructed on a new principle, with fifteen oil lamps and silver reflectors, but this also has been lately replaced by an improved system of illumination.²

¹ 29 George II., c. 20.

² See reference to the work of the Clyde Lighthouses Trustees under date 1890, *infra*.

First-class stone lighthouses were also erected by the trustees at Toward Point, below Dunoon, and at the Cloch, below Gourock, and lights, beacons, buoys, and land or sea marks at other places on the river and firth. The navigation below and above the harbour of Greenock was also improved by the removal of shoals and flats.¹

The revival of trade in Rothesay seems to have impressed the inhabitants with the necessity to improve and enlarge the harbour, which had fallen into decay during the period of depression. The town council therefore resolved in 1755 to rebuild it, and with the assistance received from the earl of Bute, the convention of burghs in 1762, the trustees of the forfeited estates in 1780, and other sources, completed the quay, and afterwards widened it, making it 200 yards long and about 36 feet broad, with a depth at ordinary spring tides of from 10 to 12 feet. The cost of these works was about £1200. Extensive improvements were made in 1772-3, and in 1789 the west pier was added.²

In 1764 the earl of Bute succeeded in procuring the establishment of a custom-house in the burgh, with a staff consisting of a collector, comptroller, surveyor and landwaiter and four tidewaiters. The earl also encouraged the fishing trade, which from 1749 to 1757 was conducted with much success by boats chiefly under five tons burden, a few extending to twenty tons. When the government encouraged this industry by establishing a tonnage bounty in 1799, 68 vessels were fitted out from the burgh, measuring 3,316 tons, with crews to the number of 781; and in 1800 the number of vessels had increased to 89, with a tonnage of 4,493 tons, and crews to the number of 1,027. On the abolition of the royal bounty the fishing trade has not been maintained.³

The movement for the establishment of the Clyde Lighthouses Trust was doubtless concurrent with a desire on the part of the citizens of Glasgow that more vigorous measures should be adopted to have the harbour and river deepened and improved. Expressing this feeling, the Merchants' House, on 14th June, 1757, urged the town council to apply to parliament in the following session for authority to execute such works as might be necessary to render the carriage of goods up and down the river more easy, certain, and convenient. The house expressed the willingness of its members to subject their shipping which should discharge at any of the ports of Glasgow, and all gaborts, boats, and other vessels that should pass or repass any lock or locks made on the river, to such tolls or duties as should be thought necessary. And the house engaged to give all their countenance and assistance in bringing about and perfecting this most necessary undertaking as a matter of the greatest concern and utility to the public in general and to the trade

¹ The population, in 1755, of the following towns was:—Glasgow, 23,546; Paisley, 4,600; Rutherglen, 988; Dumbarton, 1,480; Renfrew, 680; Greenock, 3,800; and Irvine, 4,025.

² Reid's History of Bute, p. 102; Hewitson's Isle of Bute, II., p. 203.

³ Reid's History of Bute, pp. 100-1.

and commerce of this city in particular.¹ Responding and giving effect to this feeling, a succession of engineers was employed to report on the best means of effecting this object. In 1755 John Smeaton, the engineer of the Eddystone Lighthouse (1756-1759) and of the Forth and Clyde Canal, reported on the portion of the river from Glasgow bridge to Renfrew. Within that space he found twelve shoals, four with only 18 inches depth at low water, and one, about 400 yards below Glasgow bridge, with only 15 inches depth.²

Following on his report, the *first* act of parliament for improving the harbour and waters of the Clyde was applied for and obtained on 31st May, 1759.³ Its preamble states that the river was then so very shallow in several parts that boats, lighters, barges, or other vessels could not pass to and from the city except in time of flood or high water at spring tides. It therefore empowered the town council to cleanse, straighten, enlarge, and improve the twelve miles of river from the bridge to Dumbuck Ford (about half-way between Bowling and Dumbarton Castle), where there was only 2 feet of depth at low water, and to erect such locks, weirs, dams, cuts, and other works as they deemed necessary for promoting the navigation—no dam to be lower down the river than Marlingford. A right to levy dues for constructing and repairing the works thus authorised was also conferred, but it was provided that the duty and dues thereby authorised, after paying expenses, should be applied in rendering the river more navigable, improving its passage, and making and repairing locks, weirs, and other works thereon, in enlarging

¹ View of the Merchants' House of Glasgow, pp. 178-9.

² In Mr. Alston's paper on the river and harbour, read to the International Engineering Congress at Glasgow in 1901, he says that Smeaton could not have been very sanguine as to the possibilities of the river, as his recommendation was that a weir and lock should be constructed at Marling Ford, about four miles below the bridge, so as to allow vessels up to 70 feet in length, and drawing up to 4½ feet of water, to pass up at all times to the quay at Broomielaw. Smeaton appears also to have surveyed the harbour at Port-Glasgow, and a plan and estimate of the expense of repairing and improving it was prepared. A committee of the Merchants' House was appointed on 8th September, 1767, to consider and report upon them (View of the Merchants' House, p. 184).

³ 32 George II., c. 62.

In the references which are hereinafter made to the various improvements on the Clyde, and to the operations which, with the sanction of parliament, have been effected upon the river by the town council of Glasgow prior to 1825, and since then by the Clyde Trustees, I have drawn largely upon the valuable work on "The River Clyde" published by the late Mr. James Deas, its engineer, in 1876. He, moreover, placed at my disposal many later reports and papers. More recently I have drawn upon the good offices of the General Manager, Mr. T. R. Mackenzie, and the Engineer, Mr. W. M. Alston. Of the unstinted aid given by the latter in regard to the engineering details to which I have ventured to refer I wish I could make adequate acknowledgment.

I have also to express my obligation to the late Mr. James Muir, C.A., whose professional investigations into the financial affairs of the Trust in 1898, have been made available in this statement.

and repairing the quay of Glasgow, and making the same more commodious, and to no other use or purpose. Various regulations were also made, and twenty-seven commissioners were appointed to examine and audit the accounts of the magistrates and council. The difficulties which soon presented themselves to the carrying out of this scheme, however, led to its abandonment.

In 1762, says Andrew Brown, writing in 1797, Glasgow built a dry dock at Port-Glasgow fit to contain two vessels of 500 tons burden each, at one time. It was kept dry by means of a pump worked by a horse. There was about 15 feet of water in the harbour at spring tides. In 1773 the middle quay or tongue was built.¹

About this time, the increase of trade between the east and west coast of Scotland having become considerable, the Board of Trustees for Fisheries and Manufactures in 1763 had the tract for a canal surveyed by John Smeaton,² but nothing

¹ Brown's History of Glasgow, II., 348.

In 1763 a census of the inhabitants of Glasgow was taken under the direction of the magistrates, and the population was ascertained to number 28,300—an increase in six years of 2,754.

In May, 1760, Richard Pococke, bishop of Meath, visited Glasgow, Renfrew, and Irvine. Glasgow he describes "as finely situated on the Clyde." The town is finely built of hewn stone. Most of the houses are four stories high, and some five. The streets are extremely well paved, and in the middle of them is a stone a foot broad, and in some a stone also on each side, on which the people walk, but mostly in the middle. Several merchants have grand houses. They have a fine old town house, and a beautiful new town house adjoining to it. There are four markets opposite one another, which are fronted with hewn stone, with three pediments over three doors, and false windows between them. . . . They have also a market for herbs. . . . The city has above all others felt the advantages of the Union by the West India trade which they enjoy, which is very great, especially in tobacco, indigoes, and sugar. The first is a great trade in time of war; as they send the tobacco by land to the ports of the Frith of Forth, almost as far as Hopton, and supply France. They have sugar houses, and make what is called Scotch indigo, which is composed with starch so as to make a fine light blue. In order to carry on this trade properly they have gone into a great variety of manufactures, to have sortments of goods to be exported, as all the inkle smallwares, linnens of all kinds, small ironwares, glass bottles, and earthenwares, which latter they make in great perfection (*Tours in Scotland* by Richard Pococke. Scottish History Society, pp. 48-53).

Renfrew, he says, is a small town. It was on the Clyde, but the river on a thaw after a great frost, about a hundred years ago, changed its course, leaving King's Inch Castle, the seat of the ancient Stewards of Scotland, on the south side, which had been formerly on the north. A little stream runs in the old course, and forms an island of about one hundred acres, near half a mile in length (*Ibid.*, p. 53).

Irvine is situated between two rivers, and a third falls in very near them. It is a pretty good harbour, and they have a great trade in fishing and in exporting coal to Ireland called Scotch coal. They make Scotch blue, and have a great manufactory for ropes for shipping (*Ibid.*, p. 57).

² The desirableness of a connection by water with the Forth had been pointed out by Defoe in his "Tour to Scotland," first published in 1727. "If," writes he, "this city could have a communication with the firth of Forth so as to send their tobacco and sugar by water to

more definite was done for two or three years. Then a number of merchants and others interested in the trade of Glasgow projected a canal from the city to the Forth, and in 1767 a bill was introduced into Parliament to authorise the formation of a ditch canal between the Forth at Carron and the Clyde. That project was abandoned at the instance of Mr. Dundas, M.P., who, conceiving that a canal capable of conveying ships of considerable size from sea to sea, with a collateral cut to Glasgow, would be of greater value to the city and the country generally, succeeded in carrying through Parliament, in the following year, an act authorising the construction of the Forth and Clyde Canal between the Carron and the Clyde at Dalmuir, in Dumbartonshire, with a collateral cut thence to Glasgow.¹ The stock which this act authorised to be formed for making the canal was £150,000. The first sod was cut on 10th July, 1768. The canal was opened for navigation as far as Kirkintilloch on 3rd September, 1773, and to Stockingfield on 10th November, 1775. The collateral cut to Hamilton Hill, near Glasgow, was finished on 19th November, 1777, and a large basin was made for the reception of vessels. At this period the funds of the company were so depressed that the continuation of the canal beyond Stockingfield to the Clyde was suspended till 6th July, 1786, when the work was resumed by Mr. Whitworth, one of Brindley's pupils, and the canal was completed from sea to sea on 28th July, 1790.² The basin at Hamilton Hill having been found inconvenient for trade purposes, ground within half a mile of Glasgow was acquired, and upon it a basin was constructed, and opened on 11th November, 1790. Upon a portion of that ground granaries, &c., were erected. The remainder of the ground was afterwards sold, and upon it the village of Port-Dundas was erected. It and the land westward as far as the river Kelvin, including Maryhill, now form part of the extended city.³

Alloway, below Stirling, as they might from thence again to London, Holland, Hamburg, and the Baltic, they would very probably in a few years double their trade."

A report by Smeaton "concerning the joining of the rivers Forth and Clyde" is referred to in the Historical MSS. Commissioners Report (Marquis of Bute), III., p. 209.

¹ 8 George III., c. 63.

² The Monkland Canal was joined with the Forth and Clyde Canal in 1790.

The whole length of the canal from the Forth to the Clyde is thirty-five miles, of which eight miles of the western end and eight miles in the middle are in Dumbartonshire, and the remainder in Stirlingshire. It includes 39 locks, with a rise of 156 feet from the sea to the summit level. "It," says Smiles, "was one of the most difficult works of the kind which had, up to that time, been constructed in the kingdom. The engineer had to encounter numerous rocks and quicksands. The canal in some places passed over deep rivers, and at others along embankments more than 20 feet high. It crossed many roads and rivulets, and two rivers, the Luggie and the Kelvin—the bridge over the latter being 275 feet long and 68 feet high. The depth of the canal was 8 feet, and vessels of 19 feet beam and 68 feet keel were capable of easily passing through it" (Smiles' Lives of the Engineers (Smeaton and Rennie), p. 145).

³ In 1867 an act of parliament vested in the Caledonian Railway Company the Undertaking of the Forth and Clyde Navigation (30 and 31 Victoria, c. 106).

In 1768 John Golborne, of Chester, was consulted by the town council of Glasgow, and on 30th November of that year reported that the river was in a state of nature, and that there was not more than two feet of water over the shoal at Kilpatrick Sands and each end of Nushet Island. He recommended that the river should be contracted by jetties, eight miles below Glasgow, and deepened by dredging, at an expense which he estimated at £8,640. The greatest obstacle he stated to be Dumbuck Ford, where the river divided itself into two channels, and he recommended that a jetty should be extended over the south channel, and the hard crust of gravel removed by dredging. By the adoption of these means he believed the river might be so deepened as to give a depth of four or perhaps five feet up to the Broomielaw at low water. A year later, viz., in 1769, the town council obtained, in accordance with Golborne's recommendation, a report from James Watt,¹ in which he stated that he found at Hirst ford a depth of 14 inches, at Dumbuck ford, 2 feet, and opposite Dunglass Castle, 12 feet, all at low water.² He also gives the following results of observations by Smeaton in 1755 and 1758:—

	Feet.	In.	Feet.	In.
The Hirst, - - -	High Water,	3 3	Low Water,	1 3
Point House Ford, - - -	Do.,	3 8	Do.,	1 6
Holm Sand, - - -	Do.,	4 0	Do.,	1 6
Marline Ford, - - -	Do.,	4 6	Do.,	1 6
Blarthill Sand, - - -	Do.,	4 9	Do.,	1 6
Puddock Ford, - - -	Do.,	6 0	Do.,	1 6
Opposite Dunglass Castle, -	Do.,	0 0	Do.,	12 0

In 1770 the town council obtained a *second* Act of Parliament.³ It set forth, *inter alia*, that since the passing of the act of 1759, it had caused a more accurate survey of the Clyde to be taken, and were then advised that by contracting the channel of the river, and building and erecting jetties, banks, walls, works, and fences in and on the river, and dredging the same in proper places between the lower edge of Dumbuck Ford and the bridge of Glasgow, the Clyde might be further deepened, and the navigation more effectually improved than by any lock or dam, and so as there should be 7 feet water in every part of the river at neap tides, &c. It therefore empowered the town council to make the river from

¹ Watt had settled in Glasgow as a mathematical and philosophical instrument maker in 1757. In 1767 he solved various difficulties as to the application of steam as a motive power, and, having become a civil engineer, made a survey for the Forth and Clyde Canal for its first unsuccessful scheme. He subsequently surveyed and constructed the Monkland Canal in 1786, and supplemented Golborne's report as to the deepening of the Clyde.

² In his report Golborne stated that 2 hours was the interval of time between high water at Port-Glasgow and Glasgow. In 1838 Scott Russell found it to be 1 hour 23 minutes. At present the interval is taken as being 1 hour.

In the year 1770 the revenue of the harbour of Glasgow amounted to £147 0s. 10d.

³ 10 George III., c. 104.

Dumbuck Ford to the bridge of Glasgow at least 7 feet deep at high water of neap tides by the adoption of the means advised by Golborne; to supersede the construction of the locks or dams which the first act conditionally authorised; repair, continue, and enlarge the quay of Glasgow on the north side of the Clyde at the Broomielaw;¹ to erect a sufficient quay on the south side of the river opposite that of Broomielaw; and to divide the river into three stages at the several places specified "for the more equitable payment of the rates and duties" granted by the act of 1759. It appointed the town council to be trustees of the river, with power to levy a tax of one penny sterling per ton on all goods and merchandise passing from Glasgow to Dumbuck, to defray the anticipated cost of the improvements, which were estimated to amount to upwards of £50,000. It also provided for the continued use of the ferry boats at Govan, Renfrew, and Erskine, free from payment of any tolls, rates, and duties; and for compensation being made to Renfrew for any damage which might be done to its salmon fishing in the river.

Golborne then appears to have been employed to carry into effect his own recommendations, and in 1773 he contracted, for a sum of £2,300, to make the channel of the river, at Dumbuck, 6 feet deep, and 300 feet wide at low water. He succeeded, however, in deepening the river ten inches more than he had undertaken to do, and in 1775 received, in consequence, from the town council, an additional sum of £1,500, and a silver cup, while a sum of £100 was presented to his son. At this time he had erected 117 jetties on both sides of the river, and these confined it within narrow bounds, so that vessels drawing more than 6 feet of water came up to the Broomielaw at the height of the tide.²

When, in virtue of the Act 32 George II., c. 62, Glasgow claimed the right to levy dues therein specified, it was opposed by Dumbarton, which claimed exemption

¹ In this year (1772) the breast between Jamaica Street and Stockwell Street bridges was built (Cleland's Annals, p. 39).

² By this means, it is said, 500 acres of rich land have been added to the county of Dumbarton (Caledonia, III., p. 896).

The annual revenue of Glasgow harbour during each of the years 1771 to 1775 was £1,044 10s., £1,220 1s. 9d., £1,494 1s., £1,454 4s. 4d., £402 3s. 8d.

In his "Tour in Scotland" (1772) Pennant says—"The City of Glasgow till very lately was perfectly tantalized with its river; the water was shallow, the channel much too wide for the usual quantity of water that flowed down, and the navigation interrupted by twelve remarkable shoals. Spring tides do not flow above three feet, or neap tides above one, at Broomylaw quay close to the town, so that in dry seasons lighters are detained there for several weeks, or are prevented from arriving there to the great detriment of the city. . . ." The means employed to deepen the river are then described. The machines, called ploughs, are large hollow cases, the back is of cast iron, the two ends of wood, the other side open. These are drawn across the river by means of capstans placed on long wooden frames or flats, are drawn over empty, returned with the iron side downwards, which scrapes the bottom, and brings up at every return half a ton of gravel, depositing it on the bank, and thus twelve hundred tons are cleared every day. Where the river is too wide the shores are contracted by jetties (Tour, part I., pp. 148, 158-9).

under the contract of 1700, by which it was provided that in all time thereafter the vessels belonging to Glasgow, Port-Glasgow, &c., going to the harbour of Dumbarton, should have exemption from the payment of any duty to that burgh.¹ Dumbarton thereupon instituted proceedings in the Court of Session to obtain relief, and pleaded that the terms of that contract remained operative, and excluded the right of Glasgow under any act obtained in the absence of Dumbarton, and to which it was not a party, to have that contract set aside. Glasgow, on the other hand, pleaded the finality of the statute, and the groundlessness of the complaint of injustice, and the argument “reared upon the onerosity of the contract.” The duty authorised to be levied was not imposed to enrich the city, but to defray the expense of improving the old, and making new, quays, to render the navigation, shipping and landing of goods more easy, and, as Dumbarton would enjoy that benefit in common with the rest of the lieges, it was but equitable that it should contribute in proportion to the expense. The validity and onerosity of the contract did not affect the question; it related entirely to duties of anchorage and others then prestable at the Broomielaw and other ports and harbours belonging to Glasgow; but it could not be pleaded upon as a discharge of an exemption from the new duties recently laid on by Parliament, long after the contract, and for reasons and purposes which did not at the date of that agreement exist. The Lords framed their judgment upon the general point, and, as the act was a public statute, and the words clear and general, without making any exception, a considerable majority was of opinion that no relief could be given. Though they could explain an act of the legislature, they had no power to supply or correct it, and could even give it no other interpretation than the precise terms used naturally and positively authorised. But it was observed that, as there appeared to be a hardship in the case, Dumbarton was entitled to bring an action of damages against Glasgow, upon the warrandice in the contract, so far at least as regarded the old duties. The judgment pronounced on 19th November, 1771, was—“In respect the words of the Act of Parliament are general, imposing the duty in question on all ships or vessels coming to the Broomielaw or harbour of Glasgow, find they can give no relief to Dumbarton in this action, and therefore dismiss the process of declarator at their instance.” In consequence of the suggestion from the bench, Dumbarton brought a process of relief upon the warrandice in the contract of 1700, and in a reclaiming petition craved that it might be reported and conjoined with the declarator of exemption. Upon advising the petition and answers, it was conjoined with the preceding process. Dumbarton

¹ The terms of that exemption were as follow:—“And in like manner, that the haill vessels and boats belonging to the burgesses, inhabitants of the borough of Dumbarton, are exemeed from and nowise liable in payment of any duty whatsomever at the said borough of Glasgow, Broomielaw, Port-Glasgow, or any other port or harbour belonging to them; so that both boroughs are hereby declared free at each others ports in all time hereafter” (Glasgow Charters, II., p. 287).

was afterwards found entitled to the benefit of the contract, and a remit was made to the Lord Ordinary to ascertain the proportion of dues they were to pay.¹

The continuous growth of Glasgow and Port-Glasgow induced Glasgow in 1772 to apply for and obtain an Act of Parliament to deepen and improve the harbour of Port-Glasgow. It set forth that the ships and vessels then belonging to and trading from the port were more numerous and of larger dimensions than heretofore. It was therefore important to deepen the harbour, and enlarge it and the quay. Powers were therefore given by it to the magistrates and council of Glasgow to erect works; the property of the harbour and its adjuncts were vested in them as trustees; and authority was given to them to levy duties, which they were bound to apply in making and maintaining the work and preserving the harbour free from obstruction. The provost, three bailies, dean of guild, and deacon convener of Glasgow, the proprietor of the barony of Newark, the bailie of the barony, eight merchants of Glasgow, and the bailie and two inhabitants of Port-Glasgow were appointed commissioners for confirming all additional piers and works and adjusting the accounts. The eight merchants were to be chosen by Glasgow merchants, owners of vessels trading from or belonging to Port-Glasgow, and the two inhabitants of Port-Glasgow were to be chosen by the merchants there, at a meeting called by the bailies and magistrates of that burgh. An annual general meeting of the commissioners was appointed to be held in the office of the town-clerk of Glasgow on the first Tuesday of February.²

But while Glasgow was thus active in promoting the interests of its own shipping, and preparing the way for taking its future place as a maritime port, Greenock was also pushing its interests.³ In 1762 and 1766 land appears to have been acquired for harbour purposes; and in 1772 Sir John Shaw Stewart, who was then proprietor of Greenock, granted the magistrates of his burgh, for behoof of the community, a feu of additional ground for the harbour, extending to about eight acres. He also assigned to them a right exercised by him, by virtue of ancient charters, of levying anchorage, shore, bay, and ring dues. These dues, the Municipal Corporations Commissioners say, have ever since been levied

¹ Faculty Decisions, vol. v., pp. 320-3, No. cxi.

² 12 George III., c. 16. Municipal Corporation Reports (1835), II., 16. A MS. volume of minutes of the commissioners on Port-Glasgow Harbour, commencing 23rd February, 1791, and ending 2nd February, 1864, is preserved among the Records of the City of Glasgow (Inventory, p. 3). On the first page it is stated that previous minutes were written on loose sheets of paper and put up in bundles lodged in the town-clerk's chamber of Glasgow. In 1864 the Harbour was vested in a new body of Trustees by the Act 27 and 28 Vict., c. 140.

In his "Tour in Scotland," published about 1775, Thomas Pennant refers to Port-Glasgow as a considerable town, with a great pier and numbers of large ships, dependent on Glasgow—a creation of that city since 1668 (*Tour* (1772), part I., pp. 161-2).

³ Its custom receipts, which in 1728 were £15,231 4s. 4½d., and in 1745 were £15,831 3s. 9½d., had developed in 1770 to £57,336 6s. 10½d. (Weir's History¹ of Greenock, p. 42).

by the magistrates, and the amount formed the principal part of the common good.¹ On 1st April, 1773, an act of parliament was obtained by Greenock for the purpose, first, of deepening and cleaning the harbour and making it more commodious, and, second, for supplying the inhabitants with water, and paving, lighting, cleansing, and watching the streets.² For the first purpose the town council were appointed trustees of the harbour; the property of it was vested in them; they were empowered to deepen and scour the harbour; to build piers, &c.; and they were authorised to borrow £5,000, and to levy additional rates on vessels. For the second purpose the magistrates and council, with nine feuars elected annually by the feuars and householders, were appointed trustees, and were empowered to borrow £1,500 and levy an assessment on rental not exceeding 6d. in the pound.³

The improvement effected in the channel of the Clyde, and the possibilities which that improvement opened up, seem to have impressed the town council of Glasgow with the belief that a large portion at least of the shipping trade of the city might be brought up to the Broomielaw direct, and that the relations between it and Port-Glasgow might be considerably relaxed. In 1774, accordingly, Glasgow entered into a contract with the feuars of Port-Glasgow and Newark, under which it transferred to them (1) the beer and ale duties of two pennies Scots, or one-sixth of a penny sterling, levied by it in Port-Glasgow under acts of parliament; (2) the anchorage or shore dues of the harbour of Port-Glasgow, under burden of their paying the salary of the harbour master, and £20 sterling from the dues; (3) the use of a prison and court-house, which reverted to the city

¹ Municipal Corporations Report (1835), II., p. 58. A plan of the harbours and quays of Greenock in 1772 is given in Williamson's Old Greenock, 1st series, p. 139.

² 13 George III., c. 28.

³ Williamson states that the harbour constructed by the funds raised under this statute seems to have been chiefly for the accommodation of vessels employed in the herring fishing in the river Clyde, the adjacent lochs, and the Western Isles, and for repacking and preparing their cargoes for exportation (Old Greenock, 1st series, p. 138).

In their Report in 1835 the Municipal Corporations Commissioners state that the powers of both sets of parliamentary trustees have been greatly extended by the following subsequent acts:—29 George III., c. 43 (1788-9), 41 George III., c. 51 (1800-1), 43 George III., c. 87 (1802-3), 50 George III., c. 107 (1809-10), and 57 George III., c. 32 (1816-7). In consequence of these additional powers the harbours had been greatly extended.

The town of Greenock, its trade and shipping, says Chalmers, continued to grow till about 1760, when the increase became very marked, and so went on till the unhappy war with America in 1775 imposed a check. But after the conclusion of peace in 1782 the increase became still more rapid, and during the seven years from 1784 to 1791 the shipping trade of Greenock was nearly tripled in amount (Caledonia, III., p. 807). In 1783 the harbour dues of Greenock produced only £111 4s. 8d., but in 1792 they produced £812 9s. (Statistical Account, V., p. 576). Before the American war all the large vessels belonging to the Clyde were built in America, but after that event shipbuilding was carried on to a large extent at Greenock and Port-Glasgow (Caledonia, III., p. 808).

in 1815, when a new prison and court-house were built; and (4) a piece of ground for a market-place and slaughter-house. On the other hand, the feuars undertook to relieve Glasgow of the minister's stipend and other ecclesiastical burdens, the schoolmaster's salary and other obligations. It was also agreed—Mr. Hamilton consenting as superior of the adjacent village of Newark, which belonged to him as a burgh of barony, over which Port-Glasgow had extended—that Port-Glasgow and Newark should be governed by magistrates and councillors, not exceeding fifteen in number, of whom Glasgow should elect the chief magistrate, and the town council of Port-Glasgow should elect the junior magistrate. The feuars farther undertook to pave, causeway, clean, light, and watch the streets, and to introduce supplies of water into the town; and to meet these charges they were authorised to levy a tax of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on every occupied building, with the exception of such as belonged to the city.¹ The arrangement thus come to received statutory sanction in the following year, in an act of parliament which gave a parliamentary constitution to Port-Glasgow and Newark, declared it to be a market town, and provided for its water supply, police administration, and the erection of public markets, and also provided for the repair of quays. It fully reserved, however, the property, jurisdiction, and power of Glasgow in or concerning the harbour, dock, piers, and quays built or to be built at Port-Glasgow, and particularly the new or mid quay lately built there by Glasgow; as also all rights and privileges, whether of property, superiority, or jurisdiction, which it possessed in or upon the Clyde, save so far as was provided in the contract, and also all its legal rights, estates, and interests.²

In 1775 the war between Great Britain and the American Colonies commenced, and was followed by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. But this fratricidal war was not ended and the independence of the American States recognised by the mother country till 1782. The effect of this unhappy rupture of the relations which had previously existed between the Clyde burghs and Virginia and Maryland was very serious. Andrew Brown states that up to the beginning of the war the trade with America had been carried on with great spirit and success. The strength of the monied interest of the West of Scotland was embarked in it. The imports in Clyde from Virginia and Maryland were equal to half-a-million sterling. Forty thousand hogsheads of tobacco were annually brought in Clyde shipping, which carried them again to all the markets of Europe.³

In 1778 about 9,000 tons of shipping belonged to Port-Glasgow, all square-rigged vessels employed in foreign trade, besides about forty busses of 50 tons each in the herring fishery and coasting trade—making in all 11,000 tons of shipping.⁴

¹ Municipal Corporations Report (1835), II., p. 335. ³ History of Glasgow, II., p. 143.

² 15 George III., c. 60.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 349.

In 1780 the population of the city of Glasgow and its suburbs was 42,832, an increase of 14,532 since 1763.

In 1781 Golborne was again instructed by the town council to revisit the Clyde, and report specially as to whether the depth of water at the Broomielaw could be so increased as to admit of vessels trading to England and Ireland. He then found that the channel at Dumbuck, which he had deepened in 1775 to 6 feet 10 inches at low water, was, by the diversion of the current consequent on his operation, no less than 14 feet at low water, and in some places from 20 to 22 feet deep, and he furnished an estimate for bringing vessels drawing 7 feet of water to the Broomielaw.¹

On 12th March, 1782, another flood on the Clyde raised the river 20 feet above its ordinary level and submerged a large portion of the green and the city of Glasgow.²

By the operations of Glasgow on the Clyde and the building of stone jetties at the mouth of the Cart, the depth of water at the entrance to that river seems to have been so affected as to obstruct the passage of vessels to Paisley. On a report as to this and the expense of erecting three jetties on each side of the Cart to remove the cause of complaint, Glasgow, in April, 1784, paid Paisley £150 as in full of all claims.³

The act of parliament formerly obtained by Paisley having expired in 1784, the town council applied to parliament for a renewal with more stringent clauses, but were met by strenuous opposition, and had to abandon the measure.⁴

In 1772-3 extensive improvements were made on the quay, bridges, and roads of the burgh of Rothesay. In July, 1787, the town council petitioned the convention of burghs for assistance in rebuilding the quay. In its petition the clear revenue of the burgh, after deducting ordinary expenditure, was stated not to exceed £20, chargeable with a debt to the family of Bute. In the following year the convention granted £400 to the burgh.⁵

Under negotiations opened in 1772 between Mr. James Campbell of Blythswood, then provost of Renfrew, and Mr. Alexander Speirs of Elderslie, a canal was formed, in 1786, from the end of Canal Street of that burgh to the Clyde, about half-a-mile in length, and for many years punts and scows, bringing cargo from ships at Greenock and Port-Glasgow, were poled up the Clyde, and thence up the

¹ The annual revenue of the Clyde Trust between 1776 and 1781 appears to have been as follows:—1776, £1,984 0s. 7d.; 1777, £1,397 0s. 7d.; 1778, £1,733 19s. 5d.; 1779, £1,540 1s. 8d.; 1780, £1,515 8s. 4d.; 1781, £1,721 5s. 8d.

² Glasgow: Past and Present, I., pp. 109, 111. Denholm, pp. 42-5. Andrew Brown, II., p. 51. Dr. Cleland, p. 41.

³ Brown's Paisley, II., p. 49.

The population of Paisley, which in 1753 was about 4,200, and in 1755, 4,600, had increased in 1781 to nearly 16,000, in 1784 to 17,560, and in 1791 to 19,903.

In 1785 a census taken under the direction of the magistrates of Glasgow showed the population of the city to be 45,889, an increase of 3,057 within the five years after 1780.

⁴ St. Mirin, p. 181.

⁵ Reid's History of Bute, pp. 116-7.

canal to Renfrew, which became a distributing centre for Paisley and the surrounding district. Many small sailing vessels also used the canal, which thus became a narrow harbour, with quayage along its western side.

At this time the want of a graving dock at Greenock was much felt, and negotiations were opened with the town council with a view to its being provided. It agreed to feu out ground in the West Harbour at a nominal feu-duty, if a company were formed to undertake the work, and this was done. The dock was completed in 1786, and cost about £4,000. Its dimensions are—length at floor level, 220 feet; width of entrance, 33 feet 11 inches; depth of water on sill at high water, 9 feet 9 inches. According to modern notions, that is a small dock, but one hundred and twenty years ago it was justly regarded as an important undertaking.¹ This dock is still used for repairing small vessels, though it has occasionally given a good deal of trouble through leakage.

Writing in 1791-2, the Rev. Thomas Burns says—"In the course of last century the town of Renfrew stood on the banks of the river Clyde, and vessels of considerable burden were built close to the town. But the river left its usual course, nearly opposite to Scotstown, took a semi-circular direction, leaving the King's Inch upon the north side, and running along by the bottom of the garden belonging to the manse, came into its present direction just about the place where the ferry now is. There is a pretty large canal made, on the old bed of the river, from the Clyde to the town, where even large vessels can come and unload at spring tides. There is another canal made to accommodate the people of Paisley. When the bridge of Inchinnan was built, the navigation to that town was very much obstructed. Vessels were then obliged to pass through the arches, which could not be done without lowering their masts, the channel below the bridge became vastly wider, and, of course, very shallow. To render the navigation of the river fit for vessels with fixed masts, the town of Paisley obtained liberty to make a cut, about half-a-mile in length, in which there is a very complete drawbridge in the turnpike road at the east end of Inchinnan Bridge.²

About this time Mr. Robert Whitworth, C.E., was appointed by the magistrates and town council of Paisley to advise them as to the condition of the Cart and the steps to be taken for its improvement. In 1786 he reported that by removing some rock and shoals in the river a depth of seven feet of water might be obtained in ordinary spring tides. But as the channel under Inchinnan Bridge was shallow, and could not be easily or safely deepened there, and as, moreover, vessels with standing masts could not pass under the arches, he proposed to avoid that part of the navigation by means of a navigable canal, which should leave

¹ Campbell's Historical Sketches, I., p. 67.

² Statistical Account of Scotland, II., p. 170. In 1791 Renfrew had a bleachfield, a soap and candle work, four thread mills, and about 120 looms, which were chiefly employed by the manufacturers of Paisley (Statistical Account, II., p. 168). The number of people in the burgh was 1,013.

the river a little above the bridge and join it again below. The expense of the whole scheme, including a drawbridge across the canal, was estimated at £1,900. The plan and proposal having been approved of, an act of parliament¹ was applied for and obtained, and the magistrates and other trustees were empowered to execute the work, to meet the cost of which authority was given to levy a rate of eightpence per ton on all vessels navigating the Cart, save such as were laden with coal. In the act it was narrated that the Cart, which runs through the burgh and falls into the Clyde about two miles therefrom, was navigable only for small boats in floods or spring tides, and even then with much difficulty and hazard; that by the survey lately made it appeared that, if the Cart was properly deepened from the Sneddon Bridge to its junction with the Clyde, and a navigable cut or canal made past the east end of Inchinnan bridge, and across the turnpike road leading from Glasgow to Greenock, with a drawbridge over it, the navigation of the river would become safe and easy, and great advantage would accrue, not only to the trade and manufactures of the burgh, but to the country generally. It therefore authorised the town council to improve the navigation within prescribed limits; to make a navigable cut or canal, not less than 7 feet deep, 54 feet wide at the top, and 24 feet wide at the bottom, along the side of the Cart; and to make and maintain a drawbridge over the cut or canal in the line of the turnpike road leading from Glasgow to Greenock. For that purpose it was authorised to borrow £3,000 on the security of the revenue of the river, and also on those of the burgh. In the execution of this act, and in order to avoid the shallows and stone bridge at Inchinnan, a new channel or canal was formed, about 54 feet wide at the top and 24 feet at the bottom, with an estimated depth of 7 feet. Other parts of the river near the burgh were deepened, and at Inchinnan a drawbridge was erected. The cost of these improvements proved much greater than had been originally estimated, and a considerable amount of debt was thereby incurred. Writing in 1793, on the Parish of the Abbey of Paisley, the Rev. Robert Boog says—"The work is now completed, but at the expense of about £4,000. The navigation is greatly improved, but not to the degree that was expected, and probably to obtain an unobstructed passage at all times to and from Paisley, some further operations upon the river and canal will be necessary. The tonnage lets at present for £155; but from Whitsunday, 1792, to that term, 1793, it has been let for £250."²

¹ 27 George III., c. 56.

² Statistical Account, VII., pp. 77-8.

In 1791 Dumbarton had about 2,000 tons of shipping, navigated by 70 seamen (Caledonia, III., p. 899).

The gross revenues of Glasgow, Renfrew, Dumbarton, and Rutherglen, the four royal burghs on the banks of the Clyde, for the year 1788, as stated in the returns of the royal burghs appended to the report of the committee of the House of Commons printed on 17th June, 1793, are as follows:—Glasgow, £7,239 13s. 7½d.; Renfrew, £391 12s. 11d.; Dumbarton, £357 10s. 9½d.; Rutherglen, £188 14s. 6d.

In 1788 the Greenock Harbour Trustees applied for and obtained an act of parliament for altering and enlarging the powers of the act 13 George III., c. 28. It recited what had been done under the powers of that act; the necessity for enlarging the harbour and works, and the levying of increased dues; and obtained power to effect their objects.¹ Under the powers of these acts, and on land acquired from Lord Cathcart, an eastern arm was added to the East Quay of Greenock—the old circular arm which ran westwards was taken down and rebuilt square. The cost of the work, exclusive of the ground, was £3,840. Subsequently it became necessary to extend the quay still farther, so as to cover a rock called the Leo, and in 1791 a contract was entered into for the purpose, and the work was completed.²

There are no records showing the extent of the quayage at the harbour of Glasgow till the year 1792, when the quayage extended from Glasgow Bridge to what is now known as Robertson Street, a length of 262 yards. In that year it was carried on to York Street, a distance of 120 yards—making the total quayage, 382 yards. At this time the area of the harbour was four acres, and the revenue, £2,739.

Eighteen years after Golborne had made his second report, the town council requested John Rennie³ to report on the manner in which further improvements could be effected; and on his recommendation, in August, 1799, some of the jetties were shortened, others were lengthened, and low rubble walls were constructed from end to end of the jetties so as to secure a continuous uniform channel. Of these jetties more than 200, varying in length from 50 to 550 feet, were constructed between Glasgow Bridge and Bowling, and the land reclaimed from the river became the property of the frontager owners. Much of that land has since been reacquired by the Clyde Trustees at great cost, to enable subsequent improvements of the navigation to be effected.

In 1791 the population of the city of Glasgow and its suburbs was 66,578, representing an increase during the preceding six years of 20,689.⁴

¹ 29 George III., c. 43.

² Campbell's Historical Sketches, I., p. 68.

³ The architect of the three great London bridges (the Southwark, the Waterloo, and the London); and the engineer of the Plymouth breakwater. He also designed the London docks, the India docks, and docks at Hull, Greenock, Liverpool, and Dublin, and the dockyards at Portsmouth, Chatham, Sheerness, and Plymouth.

As indicating the development of the shipping of the Clyde burghs between 1740 and 1792, Brown states that in the first of these years their registered shipping was 5,600 tons, while in 1792 it was 46,806 tons. Of that aggregate Port-Glasgow and Dumbarton, with 121 vessels, represented 12,969 tons, while Greenock, with 343 vessels, represented 33,837 tons (*History of Glasgow*, pp. 361-2). The number of ships built at Port-Glasgow from 1783 to 1792, both inclusive, was 51, and the aggregate tonnage was 6,192 tons. In 1797 the port had three dock-yards, where vessels of large burden were built and launched (*Ibid.*, p. 350).

⁴ In November, 1795, a flood on the Clyde destroyed the then new Hutchesontown Bridge,

In 1800 the first survey of the Clyde on a large scale was made by Mr. William Kyle, land surveyor, Glasgow. At that time 219 jetties had been constructed, and much land reclaimed in the upper reaches of the river. The effect of this reclamation, however, has been to interpose restriction on subsequent necessary widening of the river.

submerged a large portion of the city and the village of Gorbals, and for nearly two days necessitated the carrying on of traffic by boats (Macgregor's History of Glasgow, pp. 378-9).

In 1796 the number of vessels that came up to the bridge of Glasgow amounted to 1,326, carrying 55,980 tons; but the number in 1806 amounted to 1,678 vessels, carrying 80,683 tons—an increase during ten years of 352 vessels and 24,703 tons (*Caledonia*, III., p. 818).

In 1783 the whole harbour dues of Greenock amounted to £111 4s. 8d. In 1791 the population of the burgh of Greenock was 15,000, and in 1792 harbour dues to the amount of £812 9s. were collected (*Ibid.*, pp. 807-8).

X.

FROM THE BEGINNING TILL THE MIDDLE OF THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY, 1801-50.

Notwithstanding the depressing conditions under which the eighteenth century closed, the population of Glasgow in 1801 was 77,385, an increase during the intervening six years of 10,807. The population of Rutherglen was 2,437; of Paisley, 24,324; of Dumbarton, 2,544; and of Irvine, 4,584.

In 1800 the shipping in the following ports, as appearing in the custom-house register, was as follows¹ :—

PORTS.	FOREIGN TRADE.			COAST TRADE.			FISHING VESSELS.			TOTALS.		
	Ships.	Tons.	Men.	Ships.	Tons.	Men.	Ships.	Tons.	Men.	Ships.	Tons.	Men.
Port-Glasgow,	56	9,039	746	33	2,292	141	9	254	32	98	11,585	919
Greenock, ...	204	26,707	1,938	165	9,546	611	187	7,953	1,374	556	44,206	3,923
Partick, ...	3	103	14	3	159	17	6	262	31

In 1801 Port-Glasgow obtained an act,² mainly amending the amount of the duties authorised by the act of 1775, the mode of levying them, and the borrowing of moneys.³

On 20th June, 1801, and 24th June, 1803, two acts of parliament were obtained for Greenock. In that of 1801 the necessity for farther powers was set forth as relating to the harbour, the supply of water, the police of the town, and other matters. By it farther borrowing powers were conferred for harbour purposes; the trustees were authorised to enlarge and improve the harbour; and authority was given to license pilots, and make bye-laws, &c.⁴ By that of 1803 the harbour trustees were empowered to fill up, embank, and secure

¹ Chalmers' Caledonia, II., p. 49.

That the trade of Greenock also was being rapidly developed is shown by the gross receipts of the customs at the port. These, subsequent to 1770 (*antea*, p. 183), amounted in 1794 to £77,680 6s. 0½d.; in 1798, to £141,853 19s. 10d.; and in 1802, to £211,087 2s. 8d. The powers of its harbour trustees were also increased under acts of parliament in 1788-9, by 29, George III., c. 43; in 1800-1, by 41, George III., c. 51; and in 1802-3, by 43, George III., c. 87 (Weir's History, p. 42. Municipal Corporation's Report, II., p. 58).

² 41 George III., c. 52.

⁴ 41 George III., c. 51.

³ Municipal Corporations Report (1835), II., p. 16.

so much of the shore ground in front of, or adjoining, the harbour and town as had been, or might afterwards be, acquired by the trustees under the powers of their former acts for erecting harbours, quays, breasts, piers, jetties and wharfs, as therein mentioned, and to build warehouses thereon. It also authorised the trustees to construct a dry dock for graving and repairing ships, to erect warehouses, to form entrances to the harbour, &c.¹ Under the powers conferred by these acts, the trustees, finding it necessary to provide additional accommodation for the East India trade of the port, instructed John Rennie to design what is known as the East India Harbour. The foundation stone was laid on 29th May, 1805, and the works cost, exclusive of ground, £43,836. The area enclosed was nine imperial acres, but this has since been reduced by the widening of the quays. The existing dimensions of this dock are—length, 1,030 feet; width, 450 feet; area, $6\frac{3}{4}$ acres; width of entrance, 160 feet; depth of water at low water, 12 feet; at high water, 22 feet; length of quays inside and outside of harbour, 3,500 feet. Between 1809 and 1818 also new breasts appear to have been built round all the old harbours and facing the river, and the quays were advanced several additional feet riverwards.²

In 1806 the town council of Glasgow employed Thomas Telford³ to advise what should be done with a view to the still greater improvement of the navigation. He disapproved of the jetties projecting into the river from either bank, and, concurring with Rennie, advised that the parallel dykes which that engineer had recommended should be completed, and the river brought as far as possible to a uniform width. To show, however, that considerable improvement had been effected in its condition, he stated in his report, dated 24th May, that on 14th February of that year a Liverpool vessel of 120 tons burden, and drawing $8\frac{1}{2}$ feet of water, had got up to the Broomielaw with ordinary spring tide. He added also that while vessels could, with light winds, get up the river as far as Renfrew, the plantations near Elderslie frequently took off the winds, and left the vessels becalmed there, to the obstruction of the navigation. He therefore recommended that a path should be constructed, and horses employed in tracking this part of the river. Acting on that recommendation, a towing path, 20 feet wide, was formed on the south side of the river from Glasgow to Renfrew—a distance of

¹ 43 George III., c. 87.

² The quayage of the Steamboat Quay, which is sometimes called the Custom House Quay, is 1,000 feet (Campbell's Historical Sketches of Greenock, I., pp. 68-9).

³ The eminent Scottish civil engineer, among whose works were the Ellesmere canal (1793), the Caledonian canal (1802), and other canals in England and abroad. He superintended the construction of nearly 1,000 miles of roads in the Scottish Highlands, the Carlisle and Glasgow road, the London and Edinburgh road, and also roads in North Wales; erected the Menai suspension bridge, and the Conway bridge; improved the harbours of Aberdeen and Dundee; built St. Catherine's docks in London; and drained nearly 50,000 acres of the Fen country.

five miles—and this path was much used till steam superseded towing by horse-power. Along the path thus made, however, a valuable right-of-way to the public still exists.

At this time the quays along the river formed the only accommodation for vessels loading and discharging, and Telford—disapproving of the extension of these quays—recommended the conversion of a portion of the bed of the river into a wet dock, and the making of a new channel southward. This portion of his advice was not followed, however, and, as the traffic of the harbour increased, quays were extended along both sides of the river.¹

In 1806 the convention of burghs granted Rothesay £11 14s. annually in respect of its high tax roll, and that sum was charged against the burghs of barony for the communication to them of the privilege of trade. In 1813, 109 registered vessels are stated as belonging to the port of Rothesay, with a tonnage of 5,000, besides a number of crafts under 15 tons.²

On 24th December, 1807, Rennie made another report to the town council, in which he advised a system of dredging, the adoption of which has been attended with the best results. Anticipating also the further commercial growth and manufacturing progress of the city, he proposed the construction of two docks on the Broomielaw side of the river, and one on the opposite side at Windmillcroft. He also gave the width of the river as he recommended it should be made from Glasgow to about Dumbarton Castle; but by subsequent operations that width has been greatly increased.

At Dumbarton Castle he proposed the width to be 696 feet. It is now 1,000 feet.

At the west end of Bowling Bay he proposed the width to be 504 feet. It is now 600 feet.

At the entrance to the Forth and Clyde Canal he proposed the width to be 440 feet. It is now 600 feet.

At the mouth of the River Cart he proposed the width to be 280 feet. It is now 600 feet.

Immediately above the mouth of the Cart he proposed the width to be 240 feet. It is now 500 feet.

At Renfrew Ferry he proposed the width to be 230 feet. It is now 410 feet.

Just below the mouth of the River Kelvin he proposed the width to be 180 feet. It is now 370 feet.

In the harbour he proposed the width to be 135½ feet. It is now 350 to 450 feet.

On 18th August, 1808, another flood on the Clyde overflowed the Bridgegate of Glasgow and the lower parts of the city.³

In 1809 a *third* Clyde Trust act⁴ was passed, setting forth in its preamble

¹ In 1806 the number and aggregate tonnage of vessels that came up to the bridge of Glasgow was 1,678 vessels, carrying 80,683 tons—an increase during ten years of 352 vessels and 24,703 tons (Caledonia, III., p. 818).

² Reid's History of Bute, p. 119.

³ Glasgow: Past and Present, p. 111. Cleland, p. 46.

⁴ 49 George III., c. 74.

that, in consequence of the powers vested in the town council by the two acts of 1758 and 1770, the navigation of the river had been greatly improved, its channel had been deepened and cleansed, the trade and shipping of the river and city had greatly increased and was increasing, the ships and vessels belonging and trading to and from the Port of Glasgow had become more valuable and of larger dimensions, and, that, by continuing the works then being carried on and adopting others, the river might still be further improved. It then appointed the lord provost, magistrates, and council, who had hitherto acted as a municipal corporation, in the exercise of the powers conferred upon them by royal charters and acts of parliament, to be statutory trustees for the purposes of the acts of 1758 and 1770, and authorised them, *inter alia*, to deepen the river till it was at least nine feet deep at neap tides in every part between Glasgow Bridge and Dumbarton Castle (a distance of about $13\frac{3}{4}$ miles), to enlarge the harbour at Broomielaw, to erect sheds, and to construct additional quays and other works on both sides of the river, between the new bridge at Glasgow on the east, and a line drawn parallel to the west side of Clyde Street, in the village of Anderston, on the west. Authority was also given to the magistrates and council of the city to convey to the trustees, on the terms therein set forth, the quay and harbour at Broomielaw and the duties leviable thereat. Power to borrow money to the extent of £30,000 was also conferred on the trustees. The jurisdiction of the magistrates of the city was extended over the quays, piers, and other works, erected under the powers of the act, and over the whole of the enlarged harbour; and the rights, privileges, jurisdiction, and powers of the magistrates and council, and of the bailie of the river or firth of Clyde, or ports thereof, by virtue of former acts of parliament or royal charters, or of immemorial usage, were reserved.

In 1810 Glasgow is stated to have possessed 24 vessels, with a tonnage of 1,957 tons, and in 1814, 60 vessels, with a tonnage of 4,856 tons.¹ In 1810 Greenock possessed 380 ships, carrying 44,789 tons; and Port-Glasgow possessed 142 ships, carrying 17,370 tons.²

In 1811 the population of Glasgow is said to have been 100,749, and its rental in 1815, £240,000. Paisley had a population of 37,721; Dumbarton, 3,121; Greenock, 19,042; and Renfrew, 1,637.

When the harbour undertaking was handed over by the town council of Glasgow as a corporation to the same body as statutory trustees, the former received from the latter the balance of the advances then due to it. The amount, which at one time was as much as £20,000, was then £172. It also received, under the authority of parliament (1) £6,397, being the amount of the dues collected during 1809-10, less the cost of collection; and (2) £12,754, being the price fixed by a jury as the value of the assets of the transferred undertaking, the net revenue of which was then £6,397. The cost of the undertaking had thus

¹ Caledonia, III., p. 607.

² *Ibid.*, p. 817.

been met by the town council upon the security of the common good, and it was not until it was an assured success that it was handed over to the trustees.¹

Under their statutory powers the town council proceeded with the deepening, widening, and straightening of the river. But in 1811-12 a new element was introduced into the navigation of the Clyde by the appearance of the steamboat "Comet," constructed for Henry Bell, of Helensburgh, according to his designs.² The application of steam to navigation had been occupying the minds of men and taxing their inventive powers for nearly a quarter of a century before Bell provided his vessel. The Marquis de Jouffroy in France; Ramsey and Fitch in America and England; Miller (a retired Edinburgh banker) in Dumfriesshire; Symington, a mechanic at the Wanlockhead mines; Morley, Read, Steven, Roosevelt, Chancellor, Livingstone, and Fulton in America had all expended time and thought in the endeavour to solve the problem which, when solved, was to change so largely the destines of the world. Many of them had retired from the struggle when, in 1801-2, Symington constructed for Thomas Lord Dundas a steam vessel for towing purposes on the Forth and Clyde Canal. This vessel, the "Charlotte Dundas," was the first practically successful steamboat ever built. It is said that it was inspected by two men, each destined to advance steam navigation, Fulton and Bell—the one in America, the other on the Clyde. Bell, trained as a millwright, became the proprietor of a hotel at Helensburgh, which was managed by his wife, while he, cherishing a profound faith in the future potencies of steam in its application even to ocean navigation, devoted himself to the invention and construction of a small vessel to ply upon the Clyde. Financially unaided, he completed and launched from the yard of John Wood, of Port-Glasgow, the "Comet," a vessel, 42 feet long, 11 feet broad, and a water draught of $5\frac{1}{2}$ feet. The engine was one of three horse-power, and cost, with necessary furnishings, £192. Plying between Glasgow, Helensburgh, and Greenock, it commenced these trips in April, 1812. Her first voyage from Port-Glasgow to the Broomielaw was accomplished in three hours and a-half, but afterwards four to five hours were occupied in the passage.³

¹ Mr. James Muir's evidence before the Lords' Committee on Renfrew Burgh and Harbour Extension Bill, 1898.

² Prior to 1812 "the vehicles of communication to the port of Greenock"—which can now (1907) be reached by rail in 36 minutes, and by steamer in an hour and a-half—"were a species of wherry-built nutshells designated 'flyboats,' the justice of which appellation will be sufficiently apparent when it is considered that they generally completed their voyage in the short space of ten hours! The conveyances of goods and passengers to places more remote were a more ambitious sort of machine, generally known by the name of 'Packet,' which, with a fair wind, could reach the Isle of Bute in three days; but, when adverse, thought it 'not wonderful' to plough the billowy main for as many weeks!" (Chronicles of St. Mungo, p. 313). The going from Glasgow to the Isle of Bute, or to Brodick, in Arran, now (1907) only occupies by rail and steamer an hour and a-half.

³ This little vessel, which was afterwards enlarged by twenty feet, and fitted with an engine of six horse power, afterwards plied between Glasgow and the West Highlands, by way of the Crinan Canal, but met with an accident when returning from Fort-William, and sank in

Though the "Comet" drew only four feet, it required to leave both Glasgow and Greenock at or near high water in order to prevent it grounding in the river. This enterprise, however, did not meet with financial success, but it was the forerunner of a mighty change, and by 1818 passenger steamers between Glasgow, Rothesay, Largs, and Campbeltown were running daily, though, even then, undesirable stoppages, occasioned by the grounding of the steamers on shoals and sandbanks, were not unfrequent.

The improvements which had been effected on the Clyde by widening and deepening the channel previous to this time do not seem to have protected Glasgow from floods, for the records of the Clyde Trustees show that so late as 29th December, 1815, twenty-four of the twenty-five lamps by which the quay was then lighted were thus swept away.¹ At this time the flood raised the river 17 feet above the ordinary level.²

The first reference to steamboats in the records of the burgh of Rothesay is on 10th May, 1816, when it was agreed that five guineas should be accepted from each of the steamboats "Rothesay Castle" and "Dumbarton Castle" as a composition for harbour dues for twelve months, and the magistrates were authorised to make as advantageous arrangement as possible with the master and owners of any other steamboat coming to the port.³

On 20th November, 1820, the marquis of Bute submitted to the town council of Rothesay a scheme by which he proposed to raise £5,000 for the improvement of the harbour, £4,000 to be borrowed from the commissioners for the issue of Exchequer bills, and £1,000 to be advanced by himself. These sums, with £2,000 raised by subscription, were to be laid out on the harbour. On 9th March, 1822,

deep water. But its name is immortalised in the annals of the Clyde. Five years before the "Comet" was launched in this country, however, Fulton had designed and placed a steam boat on the passage between New York and Albany.

In 1813 another steamer was built, called the "Glasgow," and steam communication to Rothesay was opened up. In 1814 the "Morning Star" was built, and in 1815 the "Caledonia," and in the same year two steamers were built to trade to London—one going by the Forth and Clyde Canal to Leith, and from thence by the east coast to London, and the other by the west coast and round the Land's End, these being the first attempts at steam navigation made in open sea off our coasts (Campbell's Historical Sketches of Greenock, I., pp. 177-8).

In 1815 the tonnage and harbour dues amounted to £5,680 4s. 1d.

Memoranda by Andrew Scott, late of H.M. Customs, appended to "Views of the Merchants House of Glasgow" (p. 641), contain some interesting notices of the developments of the river traffic subsequent to 1824; of the canal traffic subsequent to 1777; and of the establishment of railway communication with the city subsequent to 1831. Fuller details are likewise given by Mr. Scott in "Reminiscences of the Glasgow Custom House, Trade of Clyde, Steamers, &c.," read at a meeting of the Glasgow Archaeological Society, 7th February, 1859 (Transactions, 1st series, I., pp. 51-78).

¹ Clyde Trust Records.

² Reid's History of Bute, p. 120.

³ Glasgow : Past and Present, p. 46.

a contract for the erection of the new works was entered into.¹ On 8th July, 1844, mutual discharges by the magistrates and lord Bute as to the transaction were signed.²

Previous to 1818 no vessels engaged in foreign trade came up the river further than Greenock or Port - Glasgow. Their cargoes were discharged into lighters by which they were carried to Glasgow. These lighters were sailed, rowed, and poled up to Renfrew, and were then towed up to the harbour by men or horses. The largest ship belonging at that time to either Glasgow or Greenock did not exceed 400 tons, while 250 to 300 tons was the usual size. The largest lighter was about 60 tons. Steam tugs for towing the lighters followed soon after the introduction of passenger steamers, and in recent years steam has been extensively applied to the lighters themselves. Towing sailing vessels on the river by steam tugs has for many years been almost universal. All large vessels employ tugs. Small craft are formed into trains, and each train is towed by a tug. Lighters drawing not more than four feet six inches have been known, owing to neap tides and frequent groundings, to take six weeks to complete the passage to and from these places. Steam lighters now do the same double voyage in about as many hours.³

In 1818 the graving dock situated on the west side of the East India Harbour of Greenock was commenced. Its dimensions are as follow:—length of floor, 356 feet; width of entrance, 38 feet; depth at high water, 11 feet 10 inches. The cost of the work was £20,000.⁴

¹ Reid's History of Bute, p. 121.

² *Ibid.*, p. 125.

Writing in 1817, Dr. Cleland gives the following information as to the then condition of the Clyde:—"At the west end of the Broomielaw the river is 140 feet wide, and increases about 4 feet every quarter of a mile for the first two miles downwards; the next three miles, 5 feet for every quarter of a mile; and so on. At Dumbarton the river is two miles broad, and at Greenock, five miles. Glasgow is distant from Port-Glasgow, by water, about twenty-three miles; the fall from the former to the latter is 8 feet 6 inches. The tide flows about 4 hours and 20 minutes; much, however, depends upon the weather and winds. Neap tides at Glasgow are about 3 feet 6 inches, and spring tides about 5 feet 6 inches, and vessels drawing 9 feet 6 inches of water can come up to Glasgow in an ordinary spring tide. The current during a high fresh runs at the rate of four miles an hour to the Broomielaw, and is perceptible a mile above Rutherglen; at ordinary tides it averages about two and a-half miles an hour. In common tides the first turning at Port-Glasgow is 2 hours and 45 minutes earlier than at Glasgow." (*Abridgement of Annals of Glasgow* (1829), pp. 373-4).

³ Mr. Deas mentions that the first iron vessel was built by Thomas Wilson at Faskine, on the banks of the Monkland Canal, eleven miles from Glasgow, and was launched on the 20th May, 1818. It was named the "Vulcan," and in 1876 was still plying on the Clyde, conveying minerals from the Forth and Clyde Canal to ports on the river.

In 1818 Glasgow had 78 vessels, carrying 5,721 tons; in 1820 Greenock had 341 ships, carrying 46,171 tons, and in that year Port-Glasgow possessed 114 ships, carrying 18,255 tons (Caledonia, III., pp. 607, 817). In 1819 the rental of the city of Glasgow was £270,646.

⁴ Campbell's Historical Sketches, I., p. 71.

In 1821 the population of Glasgow was 147,043; Paisley, 38,048; Greenock, 22,088; Dumbarton, 3,200; and Renfrew, 1,880.

In 1824 Mr. Whidbey reported on the river as it then was, and condemned its contraction in some parts to one-third of its original width, and the shutting out of tidal water. It appeared to him that the chief object in the past had been the making of land, and that what ought to have been done was simply to pare away points and fill up indentations in the shore, so as to allow the tide in large volume to have an easy and uninterrupted flow, and his wish was that it were possible to undo the work of the past. "The experience of later years," says Mr. Alston, the present engineer of the Clyde Trust, "demonstrated that Whidbey was right in his contention; but it must be borne in mind that the trustees, in the early days of the navigation, were feeling their way, and were bound to be guided by the smallness of the trade and the limited means at their disposal. As yet," he continues, "anything in the nature of dredging had been done with such primitive appliances as harrows and ploughs, and latterly by dredgers worked by hand; but in 1824 an enormous impetus was given to such operations by the introduction of the first steam dredger. Reporting in this year, Mr. Clark, then superintendent of the river, referred to the improvement effected since 1806, and recorded that the draught of vessels then engaged in the Liverpool trade had increased to 11 feet; that the great improvement was due to the extension of parallel dykes; and then he went on to say, possibly with a certain amount of exaggeration, that he could confidently affirm that the new dredging machine had raised more stuff since it was set to work than had been taken out of the river during the preceding twenty years." The steam dredger of 1824 was of 12 horse power, and dredged to a depth of $10\frac{1}{2}$ feet. Two years afterwards it was altered to work to a depth of 13 feet.

A judgment pronounced by the magistrates of Rothesay having been advocated by the judge admiral on the ground of want of jurisdiction, they brought an action of declarator against the officers of State to have it found that they had maritime jurisdiction within the territory mentioned in their charters, but the court decided that the act 1681, c. 82 (16), excluded the exercise of maritime jurisdiction under the ancient charters of a royal burgh, the special expressions of which were argued to have conferred such jurisdiction. The judgment thus given appears to have been acquiesced in by the burgh.¹

In 1789 the quay of Rothesay, which had been enlarged and improved about eight years previously, received farther improvement by the addition of the west pier; and in 1800 it was extended eastward and westward. The west quay having fallen into decay, the piers were repaired and rebuilt in 1822. The whole plan was then completed and the drawbridge made.²

¹ Magistrates of Rothesay *v.* the Officers of State, 22nd June, 1820 (Faculty Collections, XX., p. 155). Reid's History of Bute, p. 98.

² Reid's History of Bute, p. 102. *Antea*, p. 176.

Writing in 1824 as to the trade of Glasgow, George Chalmers says:—

"Wide is the distance between the allowance of Alexander II., in 1242, to traffic in Dumbarton and Argyle, and being allowed, by law, to trade in America and the Indies at present. About the year 1656 Glasgow is said to have flourished both in building and in commerce. From this epoch till the Union in 1707 trade and shipping seem to have advanced gradually but slowly; whatever may have been the wildness of the people in preferring field-preaching to beneficial industry. That most salutary event let in the traders of Glasgow to the colony commerce; and never did any people profit more from their opportunities than the industrious inhabitants of that enterprising town of Glasgow. Their skill and their enterprise, were long, however, crippled by their want of capital. This difficulty, however, was removed in a great measure by the establishment of their two banks in 1750. Never was there a trade carried on more systematically and prudently than the Glasgow trade in the American colonies. This commerce, no doubt, received a great check from the colonial revolt in 1775. But the merchants of Glasgow immediately applied their capitals to manufacture; being too well acquainted with the arts of industry not to profit from every event as it occurs. Peace returned in 1782-3: But the commercial establishments of the Glasgow merchants in the revolted Colonies were gone for ever, with the loss of debts owing to them to a vast amount; arising from knavery on the one hand and inattention on the other. So much of the oversea trade of Scotland is carried on from the Clyde, that when the general commerce of North Britain is shown to be progressively prosperous, this equally proves how much the foreign trade of Glasgow has prospered. Such was the vast augmentation of the foreign trade of North Britain, notwithstanding our long wars!" (Caledonia, III., pp. 605-6).

The increase of the trade and shipping of the river, and the larger size and greater value of the ships which frequented it, induced the town council of Glasgow, as Clyde Trustees, to apply for farther powers, and a *fourth* Clyde Trust Act of Parliament was passed on 10th June, 1825.¹

The bill for this act proposed to abrogate the rights of exemption from river dues belonging to Dumbarton under the contract of 1700, and was accordingly opposed by that burgh; but an arrangement was come to on the following conditions:—(1) That the bill should be allowed to pass without opposition; (2) that Dumbarton should consent to a limitation of its rights so far as steam vessels and coals were concerned; (3) that the legal proceedings between the two corporations should be discharged; (4) that the exemptions should be confined to resident burgesses of Dumbarton; and (5) that the warranty over the Glasgow Corporation funds granted by the contract of 1700 should be abolished.²

By this act the first step was taken in enlarging the constitution of the Clyde Trust. The lord provost, magistrates, and council of the city, and their successors in office, and five other persons interested in the trade and navigation of the Clyde,³ and nominated annually by the town council, were appointed to be trustees for carrying into effect the purposes and provisions of the act and the

¹ 6 George IV., c. 117.

² Sections 44, 45, 46, 47, and 48.

³ The introduction of these five persons met a recommendation by the Merchants House on 22nd February, 1825 (The Merchants House, p. 331). Subsequently, on 29th March, the House, by a majority, expressed its disapproval of the bill (*Ibid.*, p. 332).

three preceding acts, and were empowered, *inter alia*, to enlarge the quays and harbour of the Broomielaw; to deepen to at least 13 feet at neap tides the channel of the river seaward to Port-Glasgow, the present western limit of the navigation; and to improve its navigation, not only within the limits described in previous acts, but upwards to the south-eastern extremity of Glasgow Green, and downwards to the harbour of Port-Glasgow; to erect on or adjacent to the quays structures for the temporary deposit of the cargoes of vessels loading or unloading thereat, and to subject vessels navigating the river, and particularly steam vessels, to such regulations as might be deemed salutary; to levy increased river and tonnage duties to enable them to discharge the debt then existing, and to meet the expenditure which the act authorised. It required them to keep separate accounts of the trust, and to appoint a separate clerk and treasurer. It divided the river into three stages, and defined the rates and duties payable by ships and other vessels, goods, merchandise, and commodities passing within these several stages; it regulated by clauses 44 to 49 the subsequent respective interests of the city and Dumbarton, and rescinded the provisions of the contract of 1700, in so far as regarded the duties leviable at the harbour on the river referred to in the act; it empowered the trustees, in addition to the debt contracted under the authority of the previous acts, amounting, on 8th July, 1824, to £54,350 17s. 9d., to borrow a further sum of £100,000, as also not only to continue the harbour police then existing, but to establish and maintain a more efficient system of police [sec. 23], and also to make bye-laws for regulating the police, not only of the harbour, but of the river, the observance of which might be enforced by penalties leviable and recoverable in a summary manner at the instance of the harbour master, or of the procurator-fiscal of the court of the bailie of the river and firth of the Clyde [sec. 56]. It provided by Section 57 that the lord provost and the eldest merchant bailie of Glasgow, the dean of guild and the deacon-convener of the trades of the city, the bailie of the river and firth of Clyde, the two bailies of Greenock, and the two bailies of Port-Glasgow and Newark, with five merchants interested in the shipping and navigation of the river, whom the Clyde Trustees were authorised or required to appoint annually in October—any three being a quorum—should from time to time, after due enquiry, license pilots employed in the navigation of the river trading to and from the harbour of the Broomielaw, and make rules and regulations as to the fares, wages, conduct and behaviour of such pilots, and enforce observance of these by pecuniary penalties, besides deprivation temporary or permanent. Persons who acted as pilots of any ship or vessel between the harbour of Port-Glasgow and the harbour of the Broomielaw, other than the crew or pilots so licensed, or duly licensed under similar authority at Greenock, or pilots or persons employed in the navigation of vessels to and from the harbour of Dumbarton and the river Leven, were subject, under Section 58, to a penalty of £5 sterling for each transgression. It was further declared that the act should not

prejudice in any degree the established ferries of Govan, Renfrew, Erskine, and West ferry on the Clyde, and it reserved the jurisdictions, rights, privileges, and powers of the magistrates and council of the city and of the bailie of the river. It also provided for the improvement of a portion of the river above the harbour, in order to admit of vessels loaded with coals passing from the higher parts of the river to the harbour. But that power was never exercised.

Under the arrangements which the act of 1825 introduced in the exercise of the further powers which it conferred, and in the application of the new and improved appliances, the deepening, widening, and straightening of the channel of the river were so continued, under the advice of Telford in 1806, of Rennie in 1807, and of Logan in 1835, that, in 1836, Mr. James Walker, C.E., London, the consulting engineer of the trust, was able to report that from seven to eight feet was the depth at low water at the Broonielaw; that the lift of a neap tide at Glasgow Bridge (which was only sensible in 1755) was four feet, and of a spring tide seven or eight feet, thus making a depth of twelve feet at high water of neap tide, and fifteen feet of spring tide. The result of the deepening thus effected was that, instead of craft of about 30 or 40 tons being brought up to Glasgow, as was contemplated by Smeaton's scheme in 1755, the river had, by what Golborne called "assisting nature," been rendered capable of floating vessels of from 300 to 400 tons.¹ Till 1834 the river and harbour dues leviable by the trustees were annually disposed of by public sale, but have since been collected by the trustees.

By the act 1 and 2, William IV., c. 34, passed in 1831, authority was obtained by Rothesay for the building and maintaining of a gaol, court house, and offices for the burgh and county, and power was given to the commissioners, under the statute, to sell their former buildings. When the new gaol was built it was devolved on the magistrates of the burgh in place of the then existing town-house and council chambers. Under this act, the right of harbour, with the shore dues and other dues vested in the town council by the charter of James VI., were transferred to parliamentary trustees, under burden of £2,077 0s. 9d., due to the town council, and provision was made for improving, repairing, and maintaining the harbour. The population of the burgh, according to the census of 1831, was 4,817. The annual revenue of the burgh as on 1st October, 1832, was £353 7s. 11d., and its expenditure was £211 3s. 3d.²

The Municipal Corporations report on the burgh of Irvine, in 1835, states that the bridge and harbour of the burgh were till 1826 under the sole direction of the magistrates. In that year, as it became necessary to rebuild the bridge, an act of parliament was obtained on 26th May for repairing and maintaining the

¹ In 1838 John Scott Russell found that spring tides flowed at Glasgow for $4\frac{1}{2}$ hours and ebbed for nearly 8 hours. At the present time they flow for nearly 6 hours and ebb for about 6 hours 20 minutes.

² Municipal Corporations Report, II., pp. 365-8. Reid's History of Bute, p. 122.

bridge and harbour.¹ By it the magistrates and council, in conjunction with the convener of the trades and seven shipowners, were appointed trustees for the harbour, and other trustees were appointed for the bridge. To indemnify them for the outlay thus necessary, the harbour trustees were authorised to levy additional dues upon shipping and a pontage at the bridge. In consequence of the prosperous state of the affairs of the harbour, the additional harbour rates had never been exacted. Irvine is the nearest seaport to Kilmarnock, and the report farther states that the rapid growth of the latter place has much increased the trade of Irvine.²

In 1825 the Clyde Trustees attempted to abrogate the right of exemption from river dues belonging to Dumbarton, but were defeated in parliament, and the rights of Dumbarton were formally recognised. Notwithstanding this decision the Clyde Trustees renewed their effort, in 1830, to obtain relief from the exemption in favour of that burgh, and they promoted a bill for that purpose. It accordingly provided for a valuation and purchase of the exemption. A committee of appeal, however, threw the bill out as a breach of a solemn bargain between the parties. The trustees had proposed in committee to give a sum of £16,000 to Dumbarton as the price of its exemption, besides saving the rights for their own lives of persons then burgesses of Dumbarton.³

Under the powers conferred by the Acts of 1772 and 1801, the harbour at Port-Glasgow had been so improved and extended as to consist of a tidal harbour of about seven acres water area, with a pier in the centre. In 1830 another act of parliament was obtained conferring power for the construction of a wet dock of about ten acres in extent. By this act the lord provost, magistrates, and council of Glasgow, the two bailies of Port-Glasgow and Newark, the three senior trustees chosen from the feuars of these towns, and five other persons to be chosen from the payers of dock dues, were appointed trustees for carrying the Port-Glasgow harbour acts into effect.⁴

The financial results of the harbour administration at Paisley were so unsatisfactory that, in December, 1834, the debt amounted to £27,401 4s. 3d., including arrears of interest due to the town council. At this time Mr. William Hughes, C.E., reported upon the undertaking, and stated that at the shallowest places the depth of water at ordinary spring tides was from 5 feet 7 inches to 6 feet 4 inches—a depth less than the act of 1753 had contemplated and provided for. Mr. Hughes was then instructed to submit a scheme for proceeding with such operations as would place the harbour on a satisfactory basis, and this he

¹ 7 George IV., c. 107.

² Municipal Corporations Report, 1835, II., p. 129.

³ Municipal Corporations Report, vol. I., p. 198. Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 581.

⁴ 11 Geo. IV., c. 123.

did on three alternative methods—(1) to deepen the channel to 9 feet water at ordinary spring tides, admitting of the flow and ebb of the tide; (2) to deepen the river to 12 feet at ordinary spring tides, admitting the flow and ebb of the tide; and (3) to convert the river into a wet dock by deepening the channel as above, placing a lock at the then termination of the towing path, and keeping the water at the level of ordinary spring tides. The third method thus suggested was approved, and an act to authorise its being carried out was obtained in 1835.¹ This act sets forth that, under the powers of the act of 1787, considerable sums had been expended in improving the Cart, but that its navigation was susceptible of much greater improvement. It therefore authorised the town council to execute such further improvements on the river as were necessary to secure a depth of 12 feet at neap tides and a width of 50 feet at the bottom of the canal and 86 feet at the top, and to construct various other works; it provided that certain works authorised by the former act should not be executed, and it empowered the town council to borrow £30,000 on the revenues of the river, the council postponing its ranking for the £27,401 4s. 3d. due to it. To facilitate the providing of the money required for proceeding with the authorised works, £12,000 were to be borrowed on the security of the property, estates, and revenues of the burgh, and the town council were empowered to lend that amount to themselves as Cart trustees. The works so authorised were then proceeded with. The deepening and widening of the river was carried out to some extent, the Carlile Quay at the Sneddon was constructed, and a swing bridge was substituted for the old drawbridge at Inchinnan. While these works were in progress, however, commercial depression ensued, so affecting both the town council and the Cart Trust as to necessitate the practical suspension of the works, and the temporary transference of the Cart Trust to a board of trustees. The power to borrow money was restricted to such amount as was necessary to pay off debt, and the trustees were prohibited from entering into contracts exceeding £150 without the consent of three-fourths of the creditors. Soon after this the execution of the projected improvements ceased, and the town became bankrupt. Application was then made to parliament to appoint trustees for the creditors of the burgh and for other purposes, and an act was obtained on 28th July, 1843,² By it the whole property, estate, and effects of the burgh, save as therein otherwise provided, were vested in the trustees thereby authorised to be appointed for behoof of the creditors—whose functions, however, might be terminated as therein set forth. By this act reference was made to advances made by the town council, as trustees on the Cart navigation, under the powers of the act of 1835, which advances necessitated the suspension for a time of the powers of the town council and the appointment of a temporary board of trustees for the improvement of the

¹ 5 and 6 Will. IV., c. 32.

² 6 and 7 Victoria, c. 85. Brown's History of Paisley, II, pp. 207-11.

navigation and harbour. This temporary board was appointed to consist of four councillors appointed by the council and nine others, and their functions were to continue till the debt owing by the navigation was paid, or four-fifths in value of the creditors of the navigation declared the temporary board to be terminated, when the functions and powers of the magistrates and council should be resumed. But a number of persons interested in the river employed Mr. James Leslie, C.E., to report on the then state of the river, and the means to be adopted to effect the desired object. The plan which he recommended was not, however, adopted.

In 1835 the affairs of Dumbarton, like that of the other burghs, were reported on by the Municipal Corporations commissioners, and severe strictures were passed on its financial condition. "The present financial state of the burgh requires," it stated, "an unsparing retrenchment of expenditure, and a judicious management of its resources, to enable it to meet the pressing difficulties under which it has lately passed into the hands of a new magistracy. By entering into an arrangement with the Clyde Trustees for abrogating the burgh's privileges in that river, there seems little doubt that such a sum would be obtained in compensation of this right as would pay off the whole of the debt and leave the property free. It is the opinion of the provost that this plan should be adopted in preference to disposing of property, and he gives as the reason for this opinion that the privilege does not benefit the whole of the inhabitants, but is of advantage only to a few. It must not be overlooked, however, that the privilege is of increasing importance to Dumbarton, and affords some prospect of raising that burgh in trade and population above its apparently stationary state."¹

In their report on Port-Glasgow, the Municipal Corporation Commissioners animadvert on "the recklessness and improvidence" with which the former magistrates of the burgh had contracted debt. This, they say, could only be accounted for by the supposition that they had looked forward to an increase in the trade and prosperity of the town, which might have justified the expenditure, but in which they have been disappointed.² By the Burgh Reform Act,³ Port-Glasgow was raised to the rank of a parliamentary burgh, with a town council of nine, whereof one was to be provost and two were to be bailies.

In their report on Greenock, the commissioners state that the harbour trustees had at that time been empowered to borrow to the extent of £120,000, and to levy the rates therein specified on all vessels using the harbour, besides shed dues on goods landed or shipped at the port and a small charge for the harbour police. In consequence of the powers conferred by the several acts obtained down to that date, the harbour had been greatly extended, covering then a space of about 18 acres, with the most complete accommodation of every kind for trade.⁴

¹ Municipal Corporations Report, I., p. 202.

² *Ibid.*, II., p. 338.

³ 3 and 4 William IV., c. 77.

⁴ Municipal Corporations Report, II., p. 58.

With regard to Rothesay, the commissioners stated that there are no corporations of guildry or craftsmen within Rothesay; that power to create burgesses is given by the charters, but no mention is made of guild brethren; and that the only privileges enjoyed by burgesses are the exclusive liberty of trading within the burgh, and an exemption from liability to the extent of one-half of the burgh customs.¹

Writing as to Renfrew in 1836, the Rev. Duncan Macfarlan says Renfrew once occupied a much more important place in respect of navigation than it did at that time. "In the charter of 1644 it is described as the principal seaport on the river, and it continued to have a little trade within the recollection of some now living. At present there are no vessels belonging to Renfrew, except such as carry coals, manure, &c., on the river. A considerable number of vessels, however, load and unload at the harbour. Those discharging are chiefly laden with grain from Ireland and dye stuffs, &c., for Paisley. Potatoes, also, and fish, &c., are sometimes brought from the Highlands. At other times, potatoes, &c., are shipped here. A commodious quay was built last year at an expense of about £800, and the harbour is still susceptible of important improvements."²

In 1836 the Clyde Trustees introduced a bill into parliament, and in connection with it an arrangement was entered into with Dumbarton to have its privileges taken according to valuation. But the opposition to the bill on other grounds led to its rejection.³

In 1840 the Clyde Trustees introduced into parliament another bill for further deepening and improving the Clyde and enlarging the harbour of Glasgow, and for constructing a wet dock in connection therewith. This bill was supported by the Merchants' House, and received the sanction of parliament, and formed the *fifth* Clyde Trust act.⁴ It altered the constitution of the trust by appointing the

¹ Municipal Corporations Report, II., p. 365.

² New Statistical Account of Scotland, VII., pp. 25, 26. There is no charter of 1644; perhaps that of 1614 or 1648 is meant.

³ Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 581.

This bill proposed to continue the River Trust as then constituted, but was opposed by the Merchants House and other public bodies, who objected "to the corporation continuing to hold the exclusive possession of the Trust," and sought to have it vested in a body consisting of twenty-five members—thirteen from the town council, and twelve from the shipowners and payers of river and harbour dues totally unconnected with the town council (Merchants House, pp. 394-6).

⁴ 3 and 4 Victoria, c. 118.

"Under the powers conferred by this Clyde act." says Mr. Alston, "the deepening and widening of the river have been going on to the present day. On the parliamentary plan relative to the act, definite lines were laid down for the future improvement of the harbour and of the river as far as Dumbarton. These lines provided for a certain amount of widening on the harbour and upper portion of the river where width had been lost under the preceding system of contraction; but at the same time, they provided for a considerable extent of contraction. In course of years, as traffic grew and vessels increased in dimensions and draught, it was not surprising

several persons undernoted to be the sole trustees for carrying into execution the acts of 1759, 1770, 1809, and 1840, viz.:—the lord provost and five bailies of the city (excluding the bailie of the river Clyde), the dean of guild and deacon-convener of the city, fifteen members of the town council elected annually as therein directed, and the ten following persons, who, it was declared, should not be members of the town council of Glasgow, viz.:—the chairman of the chamber of commerce of the city, three persons to be appointed annually by the merchants' house of Glasgow, two to be similarly appointed by the trades' house, two by the bailies and birley men of the barony of Gorbals, one by the magistrates and council of the burgh of Calton, and one by the magistrates and council of the burgh of Anderston. It declared [sec. 50] that the established ferries of Govan, Renfrew, Erskine West ferry, and the ferry between Cardross and Port-Glasgow, should not be affected by anything in the several Clyde acts above referred to, but should be used and enjoyed in as ample and beneficial a manner as in times past, without being subject to the payment of any of the tolls, rates, or duties granted by any of the previous acts, and without being subject to any other jurisdiction than that to which they were subject previous to the passing of the act. It further gave special protection to Renfrew in relation to the accesses or approaches to the Renfrew ferry, and [sec. 62] reserved the privileges and exemptions of the burgesses of Dumbarton. It also empowered the trustees [sec. 58] to provide boats for the convenience of persons crossing from one side of the harbour to the other. It divided the river into three stages for the more equitable payment of the river dues leviable by the trustees, and conferred upon them further borrowing powers, and power to make bye-laws, not only as regarded the harbour, but as regarded the river and firth of Clyde. It also provided [sec. 117] that the agreement previously made with Renfrew as to its fishings should not be affected. The act likewise authorised the further deepening, widening, and straightening of the river, and the construction of a dock on the south side of the harbour.¹

that the widths thus defined were found in the upper portion of the river to be too limited. They have, therefore, been increased, where practicable, and efforts are still being made to effect further increases. The act of 1840 enacted that all land reclaimed from the waterway should become the property of the adjacent landowners. In many cases, therefore, the Trustees have had to buy back from the riparian proprietors, at much cost, areas of ground which had formerly been parts of the waterway, but which had been filled up, partly by the accumulation of material due to the jetty system and partly by embanking done with dredgings behind the longitudinal connecting walls. Until hopper barges were introduced the only means of disposing of dredged material was to lay it upon the low ground adjoining the river."

¹ "The citizens of Glasgow," says Mr. Alston, "early evinced a desire to have dock accommodation in place of riverside quays; and so far back as 1806, Telford was engaged to report on the subject, and so did Rennie in the following year. The question continued to be discussed at intervals till under this act power was obtained to form Kingston Dock, on the south side of the harbour. The demands of the traffic, however, did not warrant its construction for a number of years, and it was not opened till 1867."

The deepening was to be made till the river and harbour at every point was not less than 17 feet at neap tides. The effect of the execution of the improvements authorised by this act has been to lower the level of low water in the harbour by ten feet, and so to prevent inundations of the low-lying portions of the river.¹

In December, 1841, the financial affairs of the town council of Paisley became embarrassed, and the Cart Trustees were compelled to suspend payment. Under an act of parliament obtained in July, 1843, however,² the financial affairs both of the corporation and the Cart Trustees were arranged.³

A sixth act, obtained in 1846,⁴ sanctioned the construction of a wet dock or tidal basin, reserved (by section 15) the rights of burgesses of Dumbarton, and (by section 28) prohibited, under a penalty of £5 for each offence, all persons from navigating or piloting any ship or vessel of upwards of sixty tons burden between the harbours of Port-Glasgow and Broomielaw other than pilots licensed by the Pilot Board at Glasgow. The dock was to be made on what is now the site of the Queen's Dock, but in 1870 an act of parliament authorised the abandonment of that project and the construction of a larger dock.

In 1846 the Clyde Trustees attempted to prevent the steamboats belonging to the Dumbarton Company from landing passengers at the upper wharf, but this opposition was neutralised, and a clause inserted in the act of that year granting liberty to that company to lay their vessels alongside the same wharf as that frequented by other river steamers.⁵

The only connection which the Forth and Clyde Navigation Canal had with the Clyde till 1846 was by means of a lock, but in that year the proprietors of the canal obtained parliamentary authority⁶ to construct an outer basin or harbour at Bowling Bay, with wharves or quays, and a lock connecting the harbour with the canal. The works thus authorised were completed shortly afterwards. The area of the canal company's basin is about $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres, having 390 lineal yards of frontage and wharfage inside the basin, and 196 lineal yards facing the river. About the same time that this basin was formed by the canal company, the Clyde Trustees erected a wharf immediately below its entrance—on the line of the training dyke enclosing Bowling Bay—for the use of vessels of deep draught while waiting the flowing of the tide.

On 20th April, 1846, the construction of the Victoria Harbour of Greenock was commenced, and finished on 17th October, 1850, according to the plans of

¹ The last time the river was over the quays in the harbour was in 1856.

In 1841 the population of Glasgow was 273,147—an increase of 70,721 during the preceding ten years.

The population of Dumbarton was 4,391.

In 1840 the municipal limits of Greenock were made co-extensive with the parliamentary boundary (3 Vict., c. 27).

² 6 and 7 Victoria, c. 85.

⁵ Irving's Dumbartonshire, p. 581.

³ Brown's Paisley, II., 311. *Antea*, pp. 202-4. ⁶ 9 and 10 Victoria, c. 384.

⁴ 9 Victoria, c. 23.

Mr. Joseph Locke, C.E. It is nearly, but not quite, rectangular in form, the length being 560 feet; the greatest width, 520 feet; the area, $5\frac{1}{2}$ acres; the width of entrance, 150 feet; and the depth of water at low water, 14 feet, and at high water, 24 feet. The length of the quays inside and outside extends to 2,300 feet. The total cost of this work was over £120,000.¹

In 1847, says Sir Nathaniel Dunlop, sometime chairman of the Clyde Trustees, the great trouble of shipowners in the conduct of their trade arose from the shallowness of the river and the limited berthing for ships. The deep-water quayage was practically confined to the Broomielaw. Sailing ships were the only deep-sea traders, and their loading and discharging berths, for cargoes not embarked or discharged at the Tail of the Bank, lay between Oswald Street and James Watt Street. The depth of water at high tides varied from 16 to 17 feet. At neap tides it was less, causing much of their cargoes to be transhipped by lighter in the firth off Greenock.

Hitherto Glasgow had occupied, in matters of shipping, a position secondary to Greenock, but was becoming conscious of its strength, and of the trade expansion that awaited it in consequence of its position in the midst of coal-fields, and the manufactories which these helped to create. It had grown impatient of claims by Greenock to levy dues on Glasgow goods transhipped at the Tail of the Bank, and was dissatisfied with the limitations which the shallowness of the river imposed on the movements of its larger vessels. Shipowners urged the Clyde Trustees of the day to make improvements, and one of the early acts of the trust, and the first in which Sir Nathaniel (then Mr. Dunlop) was privileged to take part, was to resist the claim of Greenock to levy passing tolls on Glasgow cargoes. The contest was sharp, but, with Greenock's consent, a date was fixed when the tax should cease. It came to an end, and even the memory of it has long ago disappeared.²

In 1863 the harbour east of the Kelvin, which was its western limit, had an area of only 70 acres of water space. To-day (1907) the harbour in docks and river extends to 206 acres; but this does not fully represent the increase of harbour accommodation. Every added foot of water space has now its proper proportion of berthing assigned to it, so that it may be used to the best advantage. Shipbuilding docks and yards, which in early times made the Clyde famous, were still situated within the harbour limits, but the sites of these were bought by the Trustees and converted into docks and quays, and the shipbuilding works are now carried on on a grander scale farther down the river.³

¹ Campbell's Sketches of Greenock, II., p. 199.

² Address to the Clyde Trustees on 8th January, 1907, pp. 4, 5.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

XI.

FROM THE MIDDLE TILL THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, 1851-1900.

In 1853 a movement took shape in Paisley to improve the navigation of the river Cart, and a public meeting of the townspeople remitted the matter to a committee, who appointed two engineers to investigate and report upon it. In a report by them, the cost of obtaining a depth of water in the river of twelve feet at high water was estimated at £38,760; but the project was not proceeded with. In the following year a bill was introduced into parliament to settle the affairs of the burgh and the Cart Trust. It passed the Commons, but difficulties arose in the Lords, and it was abandoned.¹

In 1854 the Clyde Trustees obtained a *seventh act*,² which was purely a money act. It extended the borrowing powers, conferred by previous acts and by it, to £1,504,350 17s. 9d. [sec. 3], and required the trustees annually to set apart, out of the surplus revenue of the trust, a sum equal to the average annual surplus of the ten preceding years as a sinking fund to be applied in paying off the principal sums borrowed under the authority of the several acts [sec. 21].

In the same year the existence of a rock, known as the Elderslie Rock, four miles west of the Broomielaw, was discovered by the grounding upon it of the "Glasgow," one of the first steamers trading between Glasgow and New York, and the injury done to her bottom in consequence. On examination a hard whinstone or trap dyke was found to extend over an area of the bed of the river, 925 feet

¹ Brown's Paisley, II., 421.

In 1851 the population of Glasgow was 333,657—an increase of 60,510 during the preceding ten years.

The population of Dumbarton was 4,590—an increase of 199 during the preceding ten years.

² 17 Victoria, c. 62. The rental of Glasgow previous to 1854 cannot be obtained authoritatively, but on 10th August, 1854, the Valuation of Lands and Heritages (Scotland) Act was passed [17 and 18 Vic., cap. 91], and in the following and succeeding years a valuation roll of the burgh has been made up. The valuation of the city in 1855 was £1,362,168.

in length by about 320 feet in breadth, and operations to remove the obstruction were commenced by Mr. John F. Ure, engineer of the trust, and followed by his successor, Mr. Andrew Duncan, with the result that, by 1869, after an expenditure of £16,000, a depth of 14 feet at low water over one-half of the width of the channel was obtained. In 1880 operations were resumed by Mr. James Deas, the engineer of that time, and continued till 1886, when the rock was so far removed as to give a uniform depth of twenty feet at low water over every part of the channel. The means employed by Mr. Deas were diamond drilling and electric blasting by dynamite. The operations cost from first to last about £70,000.¹

In 1856 the Clyde Trustees raised the training dyke enclosing Bowling bay to about eight feet above the level of high water, and closed in the lower end of the bay with a dyke of the same height, and greatly deepened the bay inside. A tidal basin of $8\frac{1}{2}$ acres was thus formed, which every winter is full of river steamers and other craft laid up for the season.

In 1857 the Clyde Trustees obtained an *eighth act*.² It continued or renewed the powers previously conferred on the trustees to take lands and execute works for the improvement of the navigation; it provided for the reconstruction of Govan Ferry south slip and Renfrew Ferry north slip, both of which works were carried out—the former in 1864, and the latter in 1865; and on a narrative of the trustees having acquired, at an annual feu-duty of £800, two thousand square yards or thereby, with the ferry-house and pertinents thereon adjoining the Govan Ferry, and right to the ferry, ferry boats, and implements of ferry, and ferry dues, &c., arising therefrom, they were empowered to levy specified rates at the ferry, to be applied for the purposes of the navigation, to use the trust funds in paying the feu-duty [sec. 15], and to lease the ferry rates authorised to be levied by them for periods not exceeding three years [sec. 16].

In the following year (1858) the Clyde Trustees applied for and obtained another act—the *ninth*.³ It narrated that under the powers of former acts the Clyde Trustees were empowered to borrow £1,504,350 17s. 9d., and had borrowed and expended £1,013,000, and that the great increase of trade and shipping in

¹ See Mr. Deas' paper "On the Improvement of the Clyde above Port-Glasgow." Proceedings of Institution of Mechanical Engineers. Edinburgh Meeting, August, 1887. "The whole operations" Mr. Deas says "were carried on without interfering in any way with the traffic of the river, the width at that part being only 410 feet between bank and bank; during the time the work was being carried on the traffic went on at all hours of the day and night, and in all weathers, fair, and foul. The total traffic during the time the work was going on amounted to 180,000 vessels, representing a tonnage of 33,000,000 tons. The vessels which passed through the narrow channel included the largest steamers afloat, such as the 'City of Rome,' 'Umbria,' 'Etruria,' the Russian ironclad 'Peter the Great,' and others."

This rock barrier was still further lowered at a later date. See reference under year 1903, *postea*, p. 229.

² 20 and 21 Victoria, c. 92.

³ 21 and 22 Victoria, c. 149.

Glasgow, consequent on the improvement of the river and harbour, necessitated further enlargements and improvements. It consolidated and amended the several previous acts. It altered the constitution of the trust—which, as has been observed, was vested in the town council of Glasgow exclusively prior to 1825; subsequently in the town council with the addition of five other persons interested in the trade and navigation of the river; and after 1840, in a body of thirty-three trustees—twenty-three of whom, including the dean of guild and deacon-convener, were members of the town council—and placed the administration in a body of twenty-five trustees, which it appointed to be styled “The Trustees of the Clyde Navigation,” and to be a body corporate, with perpetual succession and a common seal. These trustees were the lord provost of the city; nine councillors of the city, chosen as therein prescribed; fifteen members, representing the shipping, mercantile, and trading interests of Glasgow—two being chosen by the Chamber of Commerce, two by the Merchants’ House,¹ two by the Trades’ House, and nine by the shipowners and ratepayers qualified and elected as therein set forth. It restricted the borrowing powers of the trustees to £1,504,000 [sec. 45]; re-established the sinking fund on the lines specified in the act of 1854; and empowered the trustees to fund the whole or a portion of their debt [sec. 65].

It declared the limits of the Clyde to include the whole channel or waterway of the river forming the harbour, as far down as to a straight line drawn from the eastern end of Newark Castle on the south shore of the river, to the mouth of Cardross Burn on the north shore; the whole works within these limits for the improvement of the navigation constructed or authorised to be constructed by the trustees; and the whole lands acquired for the purposes of these works, or occupied by the trustees in connection with the navigation.

Subject to its provisions, and those of the agreements confirmed by it or by previous acts, and those of any conveyance granted to the trustees, this act further declared the undertaking to consist (1) of the deepening, straightening, enlarging, widening or confining, dredging, scouring, improving, and cleansing the river and harbour until a depth of at least 17 feet at neap tides had been attained in every part; (2) the altering, directing, or making the channel of the river through any land, soil, or ground, part of the then existing or former course or bed of the river; (3) the forming and erecting on both sides of the river of such jetties, banks, walls, sluices, and works, and such fences for making, securing, continuing, and maintaining the channel within proper bounds, as the trustees might think necessary; (4) the digging or cutting the soil or banks of the river or its bed, and laying the same on the most convenient banks of the river; (5) the cleansing, scouring, and opening any other streams or watercourses which then fell into the river, and the digging and cutting the banks of the same for improving

¹ By this act the representation of the Merchants’ House and Trades’ House was reduced, though the reduction was opposed by the Merchants’ House (*View of the Merchants’ House*, pp. 490-2).

the navigation ; (6) the digging, cutting, removing, carrying away, and using such earth and other materials taken out of the ground so operated upon, as the trustees might think fit, either for improving the navigable channel or for bringing any other streams or watercourses into the river, so as to bring up a greater quantity of tidal water ; (7) the erecting, repairing, and maintaining of wharves, transit sheds, warehouses, cranes, workshops, and other works connected with the river and harbour ; (8) the erecting and mooring of such beacons and buoys as might be necessary or expedient for the use and guidance of vessels in the harbour and river ; and (9) the constructing and completing of the several wet docks or tidal basins, quays, wharves, ferry slips, approaches, embankments, or river dykes, and all other works and improvements authorised by previous acts. It provided for the protection of Lord Blantyre and other owners of lands ; declared that nothing contained in it should affect in any degree the established ferries of East Ferry of Erskine, West Ferry of Erskine, the ferry between Cardross and Port-Glasgow [sec. 88], the ferry of Renfrew [sec. 91], and the harbour of Port-Glasgow, nor interfere with the operations of the proprietors of the Forth and Clyde Canal ; and contained provisions as to the Forth and Clyde Canal and Forth and Cart Junction Canal. It also terminated the agreement made in 1700 between Glasgow and Dumbarton, and the privilege enjoyed by burgesses of the latter burgh of using the Glasgow harbour without paying dues, subject to reservation of the rights of the burgesses then existing, and appointed £5,000 to be paid to Dumbarton as compensation for all its rights and claims—so settling the protracted quarrels of centuries between the two burghs.¹ It empowered the trustees to levy rates at Govan ferry, to provide ferry boats in the harbour, and to make additional bye-laws ; “for the more equitable payment of the rates” which the trustees were authorised to levy, it divided the river below Stockwell Bridge—formerly called “Old Glasgow Bridge”—into three stages, and subjected all vessels, goods, animals, &c., passing on the river within these limits to the rates therein specified [sec. 99]. And it empowered the trustees to establish and maintain a body of police for the security and protection of the trade and shipping [sec. 120], which police it placed under the direction of the superintendent of police of the city of Glasgow—the trustees determining the number, rank, and description of the officers to be employed in each department, and the salaries to be paid to them [sec. 121]. Moreover, having regard to the expediency of only one authority existing for licensing pilots for the safe conduct and navigation of vessels in the river and firth of Clyde, this act provided that, from and after 1st January, 1859, a board for licensing and regulating pilots for navigating vessels plying in the river and firth, within a straight line drawn due east and west from the southmost point of the island of Little Cumbrae, should be appointed, and should consist of sixteen members, constituted by the appointment annually in November of eight persons elected

¹ Irving's Dumbartonshire, pp. 581-2.

by the Clyde Trustees (of whom the Lord Provost of Glasgow is one), of five by the Harbour Trustees of Greenock (of whom the Provost of Greenock is one), and the Provosts of Port-Glasgow, Dumbarton, and Rothesay. The board so elected is declared to be a pilotage authority within the meaning of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854,¹ and all the powers conferred by that act on pilotage authorities are vested in the board for the purposes of the act of 1858. It is also required to make such bye-laws and regulations as it may consider necessary for the several purposes therein specified.

As has been observed, the river had, by previous Clyde Trust Acts, been divided into three stages, "for the more equitable payment of the river dues." Goods carried over the first stage, or any part of it, were charged two-thirds of the rates and duties; on any part of the second stage, one-sixth of the rates and duties; and on any part of the third stage, also one-sixth of the rates and duties. Under this arrangement, vessels entering the Cart were charged for the goods on board two sixth parts, or one-third of the Clyde dues. By the Bill promoted in 1858 it was proposed to abolish these stages and to change the mileage rate. The trustees of the Cart, however, objected, and after much negotiation the clause was withdrawn and the stages repeated.²

The development of Dumbarton, especially in connection with shipbuilding, since 1840, has been remarkable, and has necessitated a large increase of house accommodation for the rapidly growing population. As the number and size of the ships which left the yards increased, the need for having the channel of the river Leven into the Clyde enlarged and deepened became apparent, and in 1851 a movement to effect this was commenced. A sum of £2,177 was raised, and speedily expended in carrying out remedial plans. But in 1853 the Burghs Harbour (Scotland) Act, 1853,³ was passed, and afforded the means, if adopted by the town council, of completing the operations which had been commenced. This act was adopted in 1854, and by means of it the river improvements were carried forward. Irving's "History of Dumbartonshire" contains a list of the various ships built in Dumbarton from 1839 to 1859. These number 364. Marine engines for ships built during the eight years from 1851 to 1859 number 62.⁴

In 1862 the Albert Harbour of Greenock was constructed, according to the designs of Messrs. Bell & Miller, C.E., Glasgow. It is approximately rectangular in form, and is of the following dimensions:—Length, 1,000 feet; width, 500 feet; area, $10\frac{3}{4}$ acres; width of entrance, 100 feet; depth at low water, 14 feet; at high

¹ Now the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894.

² Brown's Paisley, II., pp. 421-2.

In a report obtained in 1858 it was mentioned that the average depth in the river between the Kelvin and Port-Glasgow was about 20 feet at high water of Spring tides, and that vessels with 17 feet draught could then pass up and down the river.

³ 16 and 17 Victoria, c. 93.

⁴ Irving's Dumbartonshire, pp. 296-8, 304-13.

water, 24 feet; length of quays inside and outside, 4,100 feet. The cost of the works, including sheds and land, was fully £250,000.¹

Adjoining the Albert Harbour, and extending westward for a distance of about 1,200 feet along the navigable channel of the Clyde, is the Princes Pier. It has a return end at its western extremity, which forms a boat harbour. The total length of quay, including the boat harbour, is about 2,000 feet. The depth of water alongside the pier is 16 feet at low water, or 26 feet at high water. The cost of the pier was about £100,000, occasioned largely by the great depth of soft strata on the site of the work, necessitating the driving of very long piles through the soft material to a firm stratum.

In 1864 an act of parliament reconstituted the Port-Glasgow Harbour Trust, and vested it in a body of trustees, consisting of the lord provost and senior bailie of the city of Glasgow, the provost, magistrates, and councillors of Port-Glasgow, and four persons representative of the shipping, mercantile, and trading interests of Port-Glasgow, to be elected by the shipowners and ratepayers.² In the following year an act of parliament was obtained by the burgh for regulating its police, lighting, drainage, and improvement, and for supplying it with water, and by this act an additional magistrate was assigned to it.³

The development of Rothesay during the thirty years preceding 1862 is indicated by the following statement of total revenue for each ten years:—1832, £298; 1842, £367; 1852, £835; and 1862, £1,274. In 1848 the harbour revenue was £577, and the debt £1,391; while in 1862 the revenue was £1,083, and the debt £1,668.⁴

In 1864 the Clyde Trustees obtained a *tenth* act.⁵ It empowered the Clyde Trustees to lay down lines of rails or tramways in connection with the quays at the harbour; to make certain alterations on the rates then leviable by the trustees, and to extend their borrowing powers to £2,000,000.

In the bill for this act it was again proposed by the Clyde Trustees to abolish the stages of the river, but the proposal was opposed by the Cart Trustees before a parliamentary committee. After evidence on both sides had been led, the committee sustained the contention of the Cart Trustees.⁶

In 1867 the first dock, known as Kingston Dock, authorised by the act of 1840, was opened on the south side of the river. It has 5½ acres of water space and 830 lineal yards of quayage, is substantially wharfed all round, and has a depth of 10 feet at low water in front of the wharves, and 14 feet in the centre

¹ Campbell's Historical Sketches, II., p. 199.

⁴ Reid's History of Bute, pp. 129-30.

² 27 and 28 Victoria, c. 140.

⁵ 27 and 28 Victoria, c. 248.

³ 28 and 29 Victoria, c. 254.

In 1861 the population of Glasgow was 403,142, being an increase of 69,485 during the previous decade. The rental for the same year, as appearing in the valuation roll, was £1,625,148.

⁶ Brown's Paisley, II., p. 422.

of the dock.¹ The quays are formed of timber wharfing, with the exception of the entrance, 60 feet in width, which is built with masonry, and is spanned by a single-leaved swing bridge worked by steam power.

On 12th August, 1867, an order for the management and improvement of the harbour of Irvine was confirmed by parliament by the Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Act, 1867 (No. 2),² By this order, entitled "the Irvine Harbour Improvement Order, 1867," various clauses of the Irvine Act of 1826 were repealed in whole or in part, so far as they applied to the harbour; the magistrates and councillors of Irvine, the convener of the incorporated trades of the burgh, and such number of owners of vessels registered as belonging to the harbour, not exceeding seven, as might be annually elected as therein prescribed, were appointed trustees for executing the act; the qualifications and mode of electing the shipowners were prescribed; and, from and after 2nd September, 1867, the harbour and works were vested in the trustees; the limits of the harbour were declared to be the harbour and works therewith connected, and the beds or channels of the rivers Irvine and Garnock, in, through, and from the harbour, to the Bay of Irvine, and the lands, foreshore, and sea on which the same are or may be situated; power was given to the trustees to execute two breakwaters, embankments, piers, jetties, &c., and to dredge, scour, cleanse, and remove banks within or adjoining the harbour or rivers, or in the approaches to the harbour; it authorised the trustees to borrow for the purposes of the order a sum of £10,000 on the security of the harbour and works, and empowered the town council, if they thought fit, to borrow £10,000 on the security of the common good, corporate property, and revenue of the burgh to defray the cost of the authorised works; it provided for the establishment of a sinking fund; appointed the trustees to be a pilotage authority and local authority within the meaning of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, and amending acts. The order also scheduled (1) rates on vessels entering or using the harbour; (2) rates on animals, fish, and goods shipped, unshipped, or transhipped within the harbour; (3) rates for the use of cranes, hurries, weighing machines, and sheds; and (4) rates for pilotage. Under the powers thereby conferred the harbour was improved, enlarged, and conducted till 1873, when an act to be afterwards referred to was applied for and obtained.

In 1868 an *eleventh* act³ authorised the Clyde trustees to construct what is now known as "No. 1 Graving Dock,"⁴ on the south side of the river, and the quay or wharf now known as "Yorkhill Wharf," with river walls, streets, and other works.

¹ The site of what is now the Kingston Dock was previously a sand hole, at one end of which the so-called harbour workshops stood (Address by Sir Nathaniel Dunlop, p. 9).

² 30 and 31 Victoria, c. 73.

³ 31 and 32 Victoria, c. 124.

⁴ This was the first Clyde Trust graving dock, and there was no other save that of Tod and Macgregor on the Kelvin. The larger type of steamer had often to go to Liverpool for docking purposes (Address by Sir Nathaniel Dunlop, p. 9).

It also increased the borrowing powers of the trustees to £2,600,000. The dock thus authorised was opened in 1875. Its length from the inside of the caisson is 551 feet, the width of entrance at the top is 72 feet, and the depth of water on the sill at high-water springs is 22 feet 10 inches. The entrance to this dock is provided with a floating ship-caisson.

Towards 1870 the business of the harbour had grown and was growing so rapidly that it became necessary to obtain power to extend the quayage on both sides of the harbour, and to get authority to make a much larger dock on the north side of the river than that authorised by the act of 1846. In 1870, therefore, the trustees applied for and obtained a *twelfth* act,¹ to which reference has already been made. It empowered the trustees to construct and maintain a dock or tidal basin, quay or wharf, road or street, and tramway on the north side of the river and harbour, to levy rates or tolls for the use thereof, and to abandon the construction of the previously authorised wet dock or tidal basin, &c., at Stobcross. It confirmed agreements with the North British Railway, empowered the trustees to subscribe £150,000 for the construction of the Stobcross railway, and increased their borrowing powers to £3,200,000.

Under the powers conferred by this last-named Act—

(1) The tidal dock known first as Stobcross Dock, but now as "Queen's Dock," has been constructed.² It has a water area of $33\frac{3}{4}$ acres, with 20 feet depth at low water. The quayage area is $24\frac{3}{4}$ acres, and the quays are 3,334 yards, or 1·9 mile in length. It comprises two inner basins—the north, 1,891 feet long by 270 feet wide; the south, 1,668 feet long by 230 feet wide, with a pier between them 195 feet broad; and an outer or canting basin, 1,000 feet long and 695 feet wide. The dock is approached by an entrance 100 feet wide, which is crossed by a single-leafed hydraulic swing bridge capable of carrying a rolling load of 60 tons on any part of its roadway. The greater portion of the quays, which are of masonry, are founded on concrete cylinders; but there are portions on piling, on boulder clay and rock. The dock was utilised in sections as completed. The dock was begun in 1872, and completed in 1880.

(2) Stobcross Quay, which is a continuation of Finnieston Quay, on the north side of the river, was completed in 1882, and the Plantation Quay on the opposite side was completed in 1874.

In 1870 Irvine obtained another Harbour Order, which was confirmed by "The Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Act, 1870 (No. 2)."³ It amended the Order of 1867, and conferred further powers on the Harbour Trustees. Under the powers conferred by these Orders the Irvine Harbour Trustees proceeded with the execution of the works thereby authorised, and borrowed on the security of

¹ 33 and 34 Victoria, c. 54.

² The area, says Sir Nathaniel Dunlop, which now forms the site of the Queen's Dock was, in 1863, in the hands of the farmer and market gardener (Address, pp. 8, 9).

³ 33 and 34 Victoria, c. 158.

the harbour and works and lands and property connected therewith, and of the rates authorised by these Orders, £16,480, which they expended in carrying the Orders into effect.

In 1871 the population within the parliamentary and municipal boundary of Glasgow was 477,710; including the ancient royalty, 490,442; and the suburbs, 565,150. The rental of the city for the same year was £2,126,324.

By an act in 1871,¹ which narrated the acts obtained since 1755 by the Clyde Trustees and the Greenock Harbour Trustees, and the circumstances therein set forth, the trustees appointed by the Clyde Lighthouses Act of 1755 (29 Geo. II., c. 20) were appointed to go out of office on 1st December, 1871, and a new body of trustees to succeed them. This new body was to consist of eleven "elective trustees," five appointed trustees, three *ex officio* trustees, and Sir Michael Robert Shaw Stewart, of Greenock and Blackhall, Baronet, and his heirs male in the estate of Greenock—twenty in all. The "elective trustees" were appointed to consist of six persons elected by and from among the ratepayers qualified and registered as therein provided as electors for the city of Glasgow; three persons elected by and from among the ratepayers qualified as therein provided for the town of Greenock; and two persons similarly elected for the town of Port-Glasgow. The "appointed trustees" were to consist of one person appointed by the Merchants' House of Glasgow, two to be appointed by the Chamber of Commerce and Manufactures of Glasgow, and two by the Chamber of Commerce and Manufactures of Greenock. The *ex officio* trustees were to consist of the Chairman of the Trustees of the Clyde Navigation, the Chairman of the Trustees of the Port and Harbour of Greenock, and the Chairman of the Trustees of Port-Glasgow Harbour. By this act the trustees were authorised to exercise all the powers of the act of 1755, and to maintain existing and erect new lighthouses and beacons; to levy the rates therein specified, and to apply them as therein provided; to borrow an amount not exceeding £15,000, of which certain sums should be applicable to specified objects.

In 1872 the trade and commerce of the country had an unprecedented extension, which culminated in the early part of the following year. The building of sailing ships greatly decreased, while steam vessels of large tonnage could not be supplied fast enough to meet the demand. During this period of inflation quay accommodation could not be provided with sufficient rapidity, and ships, having to be fitted out, had to wait for weeks to obtain crane berths. To meet these requirements the trustees of the Clyde Trust, in July, 1872, acquired, at a cost of £90,660, the Clyde Shipbuilding Yard, on the south of the harbour, 23,122 square yards in extent, with a frontage to the river of 145 lineal yards. This enabled the quayage to be extended continuously from Glasgow Bridge to Govan, a length of 3,522 yards, or 2 miles 2 yards, without a break, save the entrance to Kingston Dock.

¹ 34 and 35 Victoria, c. 132.

With a return of commercial prosperity in 1872, an act of parliament was obtained to regulate the affairs of the burgh of Paisley and the River Cart navigation, and for other purposes.¹ By this act the provisions of the act of 1843 (6 and 7 Vict., c. 85) in relation to the burgh trust were partially repealed, and the property of the burgh was retransferred to the town council, subject to the provisions therein set forth; the temporary Cart Trustees were appointed to hold office till 2nd November, 1872, after which a new set of trustees was to be appointed to exercise all the powers of the Cart Navigation Acts, of whom three were appointed by the town council, six by the creditors, and three by the traders on the river; and the debt to the town council, amounting, with interest, to £38,657 4s 3d., was discharged; but there still remained ordinary debts, £9,992 5s. 9d., and preferable debts, £1,800. The act further authorised £20,000 to be borrowed on the security of the river revenue, and land, not exceeding ten acres, to be acquired in connection with the proposed improvements. In 1881 the Cart Trustees obtained an Order ("The Cart Navigation Order, 1881")—confirmed by the Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Act, which received the royal assent on 18th July, 1881—which conferred various powers on the trustees, and subjected them to certain restrictions, to which it is unnecessary to refer here. Until means could be devised to get rid of the £9,992 debt, however, it was not possible to proceed with the authorised river improvement; but ultimately an arrangement was effected, under which the creditors restricted their claims to a third, and, when these were paid off, Messrs. Bell & Miller, C.E., were instructed to report as to what improvements should be made on the river. This they did early in 1883.

A thirteenth act was obtained in 1873,² by which the Clyde trustees were empowered to construct a graving dock, quay or wharf, river wall, road, and other works on the south side of the river and harbour, and quays or wharfs, river wall, and other works on the north side thereof; to levy rates for the use thereof; to stop up portions of certain roads or streets; to abandon the construction of certain works authorised by the act of 1868;³ and to increase the borrowing powers of the trustees to £3,700,000. The graving dock thus authorised,⁴ like that sanctioned in 1868 and opened in 1875, enters off the harbour. Its length from the inside of the caisson is 575 feet, the width of its entrance at the top is 67 feet, and the depth of water on the sill at high-water is 22 feet 10 inches. It is provided with a rolling caisson at the entrance, and was opened in 1886. Stobcross Slip Docks, having a river frontage of 180 lineal yards and an area of 8,470 square yards, and Lancefield Dock, with a frontage of 84 lineal yards and an area of 2,456 square yards, were thereafter acquired, the former at a cost of £87,500, and the latter at a cost of £35,000. In part of the former a wharf was erected, and in front of the latter a quay wall.

¹ 35 and 36 Victoria, c. 32.

² 36 and 37 Victoria, c. 115.

³ 31 and 32 Victoria, c. 124.

⁴ Now known as Graving Dock No. 2.

To enable the Clyde, between Linthouse and Renfrew on the south side, and between Scotstoun and the east march of Elderslie on the north side, to be widened and straightened, 83,000 square yards, or fully 17 acres of land, were acquired, at a cost of £23,500. The width of the river between these points is now 515 feet from bank to bank.

In 1873 Irvine obtained an act of parliament¹ setting forth that the trade and shipping of the harbour had greatly increased and were increasing, and that it was expedient that the harbour should be further extended and improved. It, therefore, repealed, the Orders of 1867 and 1870, the provisions of which it consolidated. It vested the undertaking in a body of trustees, consisting of the magistrates and council of the burgh and the convener of the incorporated trades of the burgh, in seven owners of vessels registered as belonging to the harbour, and in four traders at the harbour, annually elected in manner therein provided. These trustees were empowered to construct and maintain the cut or channel, wet docks, and other works therein described for the accommodation of vessels entering or using the harbour, and shipping and discharging goods, to levy rates, and to borrow additional sums of money, not exceeding £260,000, for defraying the cost of the said works and for the general purposes of the undertaking.

The limits of the harbour were declared to be the works authorised by the orders and the act, and the beds or channels of the rivers Irvine and Garnock in and through the harbour, and from the harbour to the bay of Irvine, and the lands, foreshore, and sea on which the harbour and works are situated. The trustees were also declared to be a pilotage authority and local authority within the meaning of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, and the acts amending it.

A *fourteenth* act, passed in 1878,² empowered the Clyde trustees to construct ferry works and establish a ferry at Stobcross in the harbour; to make and maintain works for that purpose; to levy and alter rates; and to erect and maintain offices; it also extended the borrowing powers of the trustees to £4,530,000.

In 1879 the town council of Renfrew promoted a bill in parliament to obtain power to borrow £20,000, to be expended on the extension and improvement of their harbour; and, on the recital that the harbour rates did not afford a sufficient security for that sum, power was sought to pledge the common good of the burgh in security of it. The bill was opposed by ratepayers and others, and was rejected by a committee of the House of Commons.

In 1880 the Clyde Lighthouses Trustees applied to parliament setting forth that, in the exercise of the powers conferred on them by the act of 1871, they were improving the channel of the river in the vicinity of Garvel Point, by straightening, widening, and deepening the navigable waterway, and that it was necessary, in continuation of these improvements, to alter, widen, and deepen the navigable waterway eastward and westward. Authority to do this was accordingly granted; the limits of the Trust were defined; new rates were substituted

¹ 36 and 37 Vict., c. 124.

² 41 Victoria, c. 47.

for those authorised by the act of 1871, and the powers to borrow money were extended to £80,000.¹

The reconstruction of the West Quay of Greenock, between the shipbuilding yard of the Messrs. Caird and the entrance to the West Harbour, so as to give a depth alongside of 18 feet at low water or 28 feet at high water, was completed in 1880. As reconstructed, the quay has been carried out to a line parallel with, by 28 feet back from, the new line of channel-way. An increase of quayage to the extent of 1,420 square yards has thus been obtained.

In 1881 the population of Glasgow was 511,415. Its rental was £3,417,263.

In 1881 Dumbarton obtained an act of parliament² whereby a Harbour Trust was constituted, and the limits of the harbour and the undertaking of the harbour board were defined. Six of the trustees were to be chosen by the magistrates and council from their own number, and five were to be elected by local rate-payers.

The Clyde Trustees obtained a *fifteenth* act in 1883.³ It authorised the construction of two docks or tidal basins, one entering from the south side of the river, near the west end of Plantation Quay wall, and the other commencing near Whitefield road, Govan; a connecting basin between them, with swing or drawbridges, and two graving docks; two double lines of tramways for the accommodation of the dock traffic; and other works. It defined the harbour as including the Clyde between Albert Bridge (formerly called Hutchesontown Bridge) and the river Kelvin, with the whole docks, quays, and other works belonging to the trustees; increased their borrowing powers to £6,000,000; applied to the money borrowed various provisions of the acts of 1858 and 1864; and appointed the sinking fund provided by the act of 1858, and extended and applied to the acts of 1864, 1868, 1870, 1873, and 1878, to come into operation as at 30th June, 1884. The dock constructed under the powers of this act is known as "Prince's Dock."⁴ It is situated on the south side of the river at Govan, and is immediately opposite the Queen's Dock. This dock occupies 35 acres, has an available quayage of 3,737 yards, or fully two miles, and a depth of water at high tide of 32 to 40 feet, and at low tide of 20 to 28 feet. Like the Queen's Dock, it was utilised in sections as completed, the first portion being occupied by shipping in 1892, and the last being ready in 1897.

In arrangement it consists of an outer or canting basin, 1,150 feet in length by a width of from 505 to 676 feet, and three basins, each 200 feet in width, and 1,168, 1,461, and 1,528 feet in length respectively. The north basin has a depth of 20 feet, the centre and south basins 25 feet, and in the outer basin the depth varies from 20 to 28 feet—all below low water—the latter depth being given along

¹ 43 and 44 Victoria, c. 137.

² 44 and 45 Vict., c. 88.

³ 46 and 47 Victoria, c. 156.

⁴ Its site was previously a market garden (Address by Sir Nathaniel Dunlop, p. 9).

the West Quay, a portion of which is devoted to the fitting out of vessels of the largest class, and is provided with a steam crane capable of lifting 130 tons. The quay walls all consist of a substructure of concrete cylinders, with a superstructure of concrete and masonry. The entrance is bell-mouthed in shape, with a minimum width of 156 feet, and is not crossed by a bridge.

Mr. Alston observes that, though called "docks," these works are really tidal basins, there being no gates or locks. The question of gates or no gates was carefully discussed many years ago, and the conclusion come to was that tidal basins were preferable on various grounds.

In 1884 the Clyde Lighthouses Trustees obtained a fourth act of parliament, which extended their borrowing powers to £130,000.¹

In a report to the trustees of the Cart Navigation, Messrs. Bell & Miller, C.E., in 1884, explained how Paisley might be made an important seaport, and so elated were the inhabitants of Paisley at the prospect put before them by the engineers that the opposition of a large and influential section of the community was overborne, and on 6th August, 1885, an act of parliament was obtained² to carry it into effect. The preamble of that act set forth that it would be of advantage to the public and to the trades and manufactures of Paisley that the navigation and harbour of the burgh should be deepened and improved, so as to accommodate vessels of greater draught and size; that the trustees should be authorised to carry out such deepening and improvement, and to borrow additional money for that and other purposes, and to levy additional rates. It therefore directed the trustees appointed by the Cart navigation creditors under the act of 1872 to go out of office, and the number of trustees to be reduced to nine, of whom six should be appointed by the council and three should be elective trustees; and to deepen and improve the river till it joined the Clyde. It limited the period for completing the work to ten years; it terminated the borrowing powers conferred by previous acts, but conferred powers to borrow to an amount not exceeding £100,000. It empowered the council, when necessary, to levy a guarantee rate, to be called "The Cart Navigation Guarantee Rate," not exceeding threepence per pound on the rental of the burgh; and, in the event of any principal money borrowed on mortgage, or any interest thereon or on the funded debt, not being paid within a month, it authorised a judicial factor to be appointed to administer the trust. Under this authority a contract was entered into for the execution of the specified works, at a cost of about £75,000, to be finished within two and a-half years. Difficulties, however, soon presented themselves, and the cost was found to be greater than had been contemplated. Under these circumstances another act of parliament had to be applied for.

A *sixteenth* Clyde Trust act, obtained in 1884,³ authorised the construction

¹ 47 Victoria, c. 10.

³ 47 and 48 Victoria, c. 91.

² 48 and 49 Victoria, c. 173.

of two additional wharves, the one called "Shieldhall Wharf" and the other "Dalmuir Wharf;" the acquisition of lands for that purpose, and for providing cattle quarantine stations, cattle depots, timber yards, and conveniences connected therewith; and for other purposes. Shieldhall Wharf and the lands of Shieldhall acquired under this act were declared to be included within the harbour [sec. 12]; the borrowing powers of the trustees were extended to £6,250,000; and the provisions of the acts of 1858 and 1864 as to borrowing and sinking fund were applied to the extended borrowing [secs. 14-16]. A portion of Shieldhall Wharf was completed in 1886, and a quarantine station and cattle depots were provided, but they were discontinued after a few years.

In 1885 the trustees of the harbour of Port-Glasgow obtained an act of parliament authorising them to borrow additional money, and for other purposes.¹

The Steamboat Quay, of Greenock, situated in front of the Custom-house, between the entrances to the West Harbour and East India Harbour, has a frontage to the Clyde of 1,030 feet. It may be considered a portion of the outer faces of the north quays of the East India and West Harbours, but is well known as the "Steamboat Quay." It was reconstructed along the margin of the southern line of the new channel-way of the Clyde. Prior to this reconstruction the line of quay face was irregular, and the depth alongside was in some places not more than 7 or 8 feet at low water. Now there is a straight line of quay, with a depth of 18 feet at low water, or 28 feet at high water, and, owing to the work being carried out to the new line of channel-way, about 3,960 square yards of quayage area has been obtained. The reconstruction was completed in 1885, at a cost of £40,774.

The reconstructed West and Steamboat Quays are now connected by one of Kinniple's patent travelling and folding bridges, which spans the entrance to the West Harbour. The dimensions of the bridge are—Span, 103 feet 5 inches; width, 20 feet; height, 32 feet.

The Clyde Trustees obtained a *seventeenth* act in 1887.² It extended the periods limited by the act of 1883 for the compulsory purchase of lands and for the completion of the railway thereby authorised, and conferred further powers on the trustees and the Clyde Pilot Board as to the collection of rates. In addition to the powers conferred on that board by the Clyde Navigation Consolidation Act of 1858, the act of 1887 empowered the board to require the proprietors or lessees of any harbours, piers, quays, or wharfs at the several places mentioned in the schedule to the act, to erect, in or near to such harbours, &c., such signalling apparatus as should be mutually approved of by it and such proprietors or lessees, or by the Board of Trade in case of difference of opinion. In the event of such signalling apparatus not being erected and fitted up by the proprietors or lessees for a month after the Pilot Board had requested them to do so, or within a month after the sanction of the Board of Trade had been given, the Pilot Board was empowered to execute the necessary works, and the cost of such erection, and of the applica-

¹ 48 Victoria, c. 17.

² 50 Victoria, session 2, c. 8.

tion to the Board of Trade, and also of the further maintenance of the works, was made a charge on such proprietors and lessees. The Pilot Board was also empowered to make bye-laws for the regulation of the working and management of the signalling apparatus, and the observance of them by masters of steam vessels, and to alter or repeal such bye-laws. These, however, had to be confirmed by the Board of Trade before coming into operation.

In an address delivered by Mr. Deas to the Institute of Mechanical Engineers at Edinburgh, in 1887, he thus described the changes which had been made in the Clyde during the preceding century:—"A hundred years ago at Glasgow there was at low water a depth of 15 inches. Now they had from 18 to 20 feet at Glasgow at low water. One hundred years ago high water was only noticeable at Glasgow—it came rippling up. Now they had 11 feet range of tide, and a good deal of the depth had been obtained, not by the raising of high water, but by taking out the bottom, which was now virtually level from Port-Glasgow to Glasgow. The tide at Glasgow a hundred years ago was three hours later than at Port-Glasgow. It was now only one hour later. In 1871 there took place fifty-nine groundings between Glasgow and the sea, and the maximum draught was 21 feet 7 inches. Last year the groundings were only sixteen (of which six were beyond the bounds of the Clyde Trust jurisdiction), and the maximum draught was 24 feet 9 inches.

An *eighteenth* Clyde Trust act, obtained in 1888,¹ repealed the provisions of the act of 1858 in regard to the election of trustees by shipowners and ratepayers, and enacted new rules to be observed in these elections.

By a *nineteenth* act, obtained in 1890,² the Clyde Trustees were authorised to construct a new road with tramways upon it, in part substitution for certain roads and tramways authorised by the act of 1883; to abandon two graving docks which had been authorised; to construct and maintain a new graving dock immediately to the south of, and parallel with, the two existing graving docks, commencing on the west side of the entrance to the docks authorised by the act of 1883, and terminating at or near the east side of Maxwell Street, Govan; to abandon some other works authorised by the act of 1883; and for other purposes. Under the powers conferred by this act, "Graving Dock No. 3" was formed. Opened in 1898, it is one of the largest of the kind in the United Kingdom. Its total length is 880 feet; the width at the entrance is 83 feet; and it has a depth of water of 26½ feet on the sill at high-water spring tides. This dock has a rolling caisson at entrance, and a pair of inside gates whereby it can be divided into an outer section, 460 feet in length, and an inner section, 420 feet in length.

Under the powers conferred by their act of 1885 the Cart Navigation Trustees proceeded with the execution of the works thereby authorised, but after a time discovered that the cost was much greater than had been anticipated. They there-

¹ 51 Victoria, c. 20.

² 53 and 54 Victoria, c. 156.

fore promoted and obtained another act in 1890 to obtain authority to borrow an additional sum of £30,000 and to levy additional rates.¹ But these additional powers did not enable the trustees to extricate matters, and in October, 1891, public intimation was made that, owing to financial difficulties, a temporary stoppage of the improvements had to take place. The cause of this stoppage was afterwards stated to be that the removal of large and unexpected quantities of rock, discovered in the bed of the river, would necessitate an expenditure beyond the resources of the trustees. It was then resolved to apply to the town council, and ask it to co-operate with the trustees in the promotion of another bill for authority to borrow an additional sum of £25,000 to equip the quays and obtain railway connections, and to authorise increased assessments. This proposal was, however, negatived by the ratepayers of the burgh, and the works came to a standstill. So matters practically remained till 27th February, 1904, when on an application to the court a judicial factor was appointed to administer the trust. The entire debt of the trust amounted at that time to £123,664 17s. 1½d. Of that debt, mortgages ranked for £121,535—those under the act of 1885 for £97,395, and those under the act of 1890 for £24,140. In addition to these sums there was a large accumulation of arrears of interest on the mortgage debt.

On 22nd May, 1890, the trustees of Port-Glasgow obtained an act enabling them to convert their mortgage debt into debenture debt; to alter the constitution of the Trust; and for other purposes.²

By the Pilotage Order Confirmation (No. 1) Act, 1890,³ the river pilots were empowered to elect three pilots or ex-pilots to be members of the Pilot Board, which was thus increased in number to nineteen.

In 1890 the Clyde Lighthouses Trustees obtained a fifth act,⁴ by which the period limited by their act of 1880 within which the works authorised by that act were to be completed and lands purchased was extended till 6th August, 1895.

Under the powers conferred by the several Clyde Lighthouses Trust Acts, to which reference has been made,⁵ a lightship is stationed at Garvel Point, above Greenock, two light towers have been erected at Port-Glasgow, and beacons and buoys have been put down where required about the firth. Several of the beacons and many of the buoys are lighted with Pintsch's patent compressed oil gas. The trustees possess a steam tender provided with gas receivers for conveying the gas required by the various lighthouses, light towers, the light ship, and the lighted beacons and buoys. For use during foggy weather the Cumbrae lighthouse is provided with a fog horn, the Cloch with a syren, and Toward and several of the buoys with bells.

The principal work which the trustees have carried out for the improvement of the river has been the dredging of a channel on improved lines, 23 feet deep

¹ 53 Victoria, c. 11.

⁴ 53 Victoria, c. 7.

² 53 and 54 Victoria, c. 22.

⁵ First reference, *antea*, p. 175.

³ *Ibid.*, c. 207.

at low water, from the Tail of the Bank, opposite Albert Harbour, Greenock, to the Clyde Trustees' boundary line at Port-Glasgow, a distance of four miles. The work was begun in 1873, under the powers of the act obtained in 1871,¹ and was carried on with hired plant till 1880, when the trustees resolved to push on more expeditiously, and got plant of their own.² The channel thus formed has a depth of 23 feet at low water, and a minimum bottom width of 300 feet, and side slopes, with depths varying from 23 to 20 feet, for a minimum width of 100 feet on either side, according to the nature of the material passed through. This channel is carefully marked by lights on shore, and by ordinary and gas-lit buoys.

A *twentieth* Clyde Trust act, in 1891,³ authorised the construction of (1) a new road, with tramways upon it, in substitution for portions of roads and tramways authorised by the acts of 1883 and 1890; (2) other roads, a railway, and a dock tramway; and (3) a quay or wharf at Clydebank. It also (4) sanctioned the abandonment of the railway and some of the works authorised by the acts of 1883 and 1890.

In 1891 the population of the city of Glasgow was 565,714. Its rental was £3,455,510. But in this year the boundaries of the city were extended, and the population of the enlarged city was 656,185. Its rental was £4,033,554.

A *twenty-first* Clyde Trust act, in 1894,⁴ extended the periods limited by the act of 1891 for the compulsory purchase of lands, and for the completion of the railway then authorised, and conferred further powers on the trustees as to rates and other objects.⁵

In 1896 the burgh of Irvine obtained an act empowering it to construct a weir or dam across the river Irvine, to construct a new bridge over that river, with roads of access thereto, to widen and improve streets, and for other purposes.⁶

A *twenty-second* Clyde Trust act, obtained by the trustees in 1897,⁷ extended the periods limited by the act of 1894 for the compulsory purchase of lands, and for the completion of the railways authorised by the act of 1891.

In 1896-7 a bill was promoted in Parliament by certain persons to obtain statutory authority to construct a dock, $11\frac{1}{2}$ acres in extent, at Old Kilpatrick, a mile above the harbour of Bowling, formed in 1846 as an exit into the Clyde

¹ The Clyde Lighthouses Act, 1871, 34 and 35 Victoria, c. 132.

² See paper by Mr. Charles A. Stevenson, C.E., "On the Dredging of the Lower Estuary of the Clyde," in Proceedings of Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Edinburgh Meeting, August, 1887.

³ 54 Victoria, c. 38.

⁴ 57 and 58 Victoria, c. 168.

⁵ In 1895, Mr. Deas states, the water area of the harbour was $172\frac{1}{2}$ acres—an extension during twenty-seven years of $102\frac{1}{2}$ acres; the quayage 11,883 yards—an extension during the same period of 6,279 yards; and the revenue £371,976, an increase during these years of £228,136. [Engineering Review, 21st January, 1895.]

⁶ 59 and 60 Victoria, c. 40.

⁷ 60 and 61 Victoria, c. 31.

from the Forth and Clyde Canal. But the project was strenuously resisted, both by the Clyde Trustees and by the Corporation of Glasgow, who maintained that, so long as the trustees fulfilled the function for which they were appointed by parliament, no other harbour authority should be allowed to intervene. That contention the committee of the Commons to which the bill was referred sustained, after a prolonged and costly enquiry. Nevertheless, the same parties gave public intimation of their intention to renew the struggle in session 1897-98, but the hazard of such an attempt seems to have induced them to defer it. In that session, however, the town council of Renfrew promoted a bill for authority to construct a tidal dock, on the lands of Elderslie, east of the Pudzeoch. The scheme also proposed a considerable extension of the boundaries of the burgh of Renfrew, so as to include, not only the site of the proposed harbour, but also a large rural area not occupied by houses or other buildings, and also an area on which the Corporation of Glasgow were obtaining parliamentary powers to erect works in connection with the sewage of the south side of the city. The Clyde Trustees and Glasgow corporation likewise opposed this bill, and although ineffectual in the Commons committee their opposition was successful before the Lords committee, who disallowed the bill.

In the session of 1898-9 the Clyde Trustees promoted a bill seeking power to construct two tidal docks, one on the lands of Shieldhall and another at Clydebank; and the Burgh of Renfrew also again promoted a bill seeking power to extend its municipal boundaries and to construct a tidal dock or basin, and other works, on the same site as previously proposed. The two bills were introduced into the House of Lords, and were remitted to the same committee, by whom they were taken together and allowed to proceed. Both bills subsequently went before a committee of the Commons, who found that the preamble of the Renfrew bill was proved, as also that of the Clyde Trust bill, with the exception of the portion relating to the proposed dock at Shieldhall.

As so adjusted and passed into law, this *twenty-third* Clyde Trust act, obtained in 1899, empowered the trustees to construct (1) a tidal dock at Clydebank, on the north side of the river Clyde, on the lands of Barns of Clyde; with a widening of the river at the same place; recesses on the north and south sides of the river for a new vehicular ferry at Whiteinch, and for the substitution of a high-level ferry for the existing ferry at Govan; with subsidiary works and power to divert the river into the new dock and recesses, powers to stop up specified footpaths, to alter specified roads, to acquire additional lands, and to dredge and deepen accesses to new docks, &c. Seven years were allowed for the completion of the works. This act also empowered the trustees to establish and maintain high-level ferries at Whiteinch and Govan, and to borrow £1,000,000 in addition to the £6,250,000 previously authorised, and to extend to this act the provisions of the act of 1883 as to the sinking fund.¹

¹ 62 and 63 Victoria, c. 239.

Under an agreement scheduled to this act, the interest of the Clyde Trustees in the Prince's Dock Branch Railway was transferred to the Caledonian, North British, and Glasgow and South-Western Railway Companies, and the trustees sold to the companies certain lands on the track of the branch, the companies undertaking to construct and equip the line. This railway starts at Ibrox off the Govan branch of the Glasgow and Paisley Joint-Line Railway, and terminates at the south-east end of Prince's Dock, where it joins the dock tramways. It was opened for traffic in August, 1903, and by its means the south side of the harbour obtained railway connection, in addition to that at the General Terminus. Coincident with the completion of the Prince's Dock branch, the Clyde Trustees began to work their first coaling hoist, erected on the south quay of Prince's Dock.

XII.

OPENING YEARS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY 1901-8.

The dock at Clydebank, authorised by the act of 1899, was commenced in August, 1900, and was opened by the Prince and Princess of Wales on 25th April, 1907, and named the Rothesay Dock. The dock comprises an outer basin and an inner basin, with a combined water area of $19\frac{2}{3}$ acres, and available quayage to the extent of 1,847 yards. Outside of the dock, along the river, a quay wall, 199 yards in length, has been provided. This dock is primarily intended for the export of coal, and the import of iron ore and other minerals. By June, 1905, the outer basin was sufficiently dredged out to accommodate vessels requiring to be laid up, and since then the basin has been in constant use for this purpose. The construction of the dock walls was almost completed in 1907, and fully one half of the dock is now being utilised for traffic. Two coaling hoists have been erected, and two more will be provided. For dealing with the ore traffic, ten cranes are at work, and a number more, along with transporters, will be provided.

The interesting feature of the equipment of this dock is that the hoists, cranes, capstans, and turntables are worked by electric power, and that this is the first case in the United Kingdom in which electric power has been applied to coaling hoists. An extensive power-house has been erected at the dock for generating the electric current. About 55 acres of ground surround the dock, so there is ample room for siding accommodation.

To ensure the best railway connections with this dock, the North British Railway Company constructed a branch to it from their Yoker and Clydebank Railway, and the Caledonian Railway Company constructed a branch to it from the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway, both under authority of the act of parliament 3 Edward VII., c. 74.

To provide for the river passenger traffic, the Clyde Trustees, in 1884, established a service of small steamers called "Cluthas,"¹ running between Victoria Bridge and Whiteinch, a distance of about 3 miles, with intermediate landing places. These steamers, eleven in number, had twin screws, and accommodated

¹ Clutha being the Gaelic name of the Clyde.

from 235 to 360 passengers. In 1900 they carried 2,849,263 passengers. But the introduction by Glasgow corporation of a system of electric cars on the main roads of the city and its vicinity north and south of the Clyde superseded the necessity for maintaining the "Clutha" service, and towards the end of 1903 these steamers were withdrawn.

To meet the requirements of cross-river communication between Glasgow Bridge and Whiteinch, the trustees have organised seven ferries for passengers, and three ferries for vehicular and passenger traffic combined. The passenger traffic is carried on by eleven small steamers, with screws at each end to obviate the necessity for turning. These boats are licensed to carry from 93 to 148 passengers, and are supplied with fire engines for use in case of fires breaking out on board vessels. One of the vehicular ferries at Stobcross is worked by a boat of novel design, provided with four screws, two at each end, and having an elevated deck capable of being raised or lowered so as to be kept at the same level as the quay at any state of the tide. This vessel can take 258 passengers and ten carts with horses, or 700 passengers exclusively. After the recesses at Whiteinch authorised by the 1899 act had been constructed, the ferry there was, in 1905, opened for traffic by an elevating deck steamer similar to that at Stobcross. The other vehicular ferry is at Govan, and is still of the old type, consisting of a boat worked by steam on two chains laid across the river. This boat carries eight horses and carts and 140 passengers, or 500 passengers alone. Over eight million passengers and half a million vehicles are carried by these cross-ferrries annually.

In 1903 an important widening of the Clyde at Elderslie, about a mile in length, was commenced, and about 7 acres of land were dredged away to form water space. In consequence also of the growing demands for greater depth of water, the Clyde Trust decided, the same year, to resume operations on the Elderslie rock barrier, referred to above,¹ and to blast it to the depth of 28 feet below low water, so as to provide a safe navigable depth of 25 feet or 26 feet. The boring was, for the most part, done from barges fitted with steam rock drills working over the side through the water directly on to the bed of the river. The area of ground operated upon was about $5\frac{1}{2}$ acres, and the work took nearly 4 years to complete. From first to last, about 20 feet in depth of rock have been removed, and the total cost has been about £140,000.

In connection with the main drainage scheme authorised by parliament in 1898, the corporation of Glasgow had power to construct sewage works on the lands of Braehead, but as their position there would have proved a serious obstacle to the continuous dock accommodation which the Clyde Trustees had in view, an agreement was come to whereby the trustees obtained possession of the Braehead ground in exchange for a site at Shieldhall, and this arrangement was subsequently confirmed by act of parliament in 1904.²

¹ *Antea*, pp. 209-10.

² 4 Edward VII., c. 192.

A *twenty-fourth* Clyde Trust act, obtained in 1904,¹ set forth in its preamble that the trade of the harbour and the number and size of the vessels resorting to it had so increased, and were so increasing, as to necessitate the providing of further accommodation, and the levying of rates and tolls for the use thereof. It therefore authorised (1) the construction of a quay, with three basins, on the lands of Yorkhill and Kelvinhaugh, and in connection therewith a dock, tramway, and two diversions of Pointhouse Road; (2) a quay on the lands of Merklands, in the burgh of Partick; and (3) river widenings on the south side of the river at Blythswood, Inchinnan, Newshot, and Rashielee, and on the north side of the river at Dalmuir. It further authorised the discontinuance of Partick Wharf, the dredging and deepening of the river, the acquisition of additional lands and servitudes, the use of electrical power, the storage of goods, the levying of special rates and tolls, and the borrowing of £600,000 in addition to the £7,250,000 previously authorised. It also confirmed an agreement made with the proprietor of Erskine estate, covering widenings on both sides of the river, east of Erskine Ferry, and the transfer of that ferry, and the rights of the, by that time discontinued, West Ferry, near Langbank. By the acquisition of the Erskine Ferry, which had for long been a source of trouble to them, the trustees obtained possession of all cross-river ferries below Glasgow, with the exception of that at Renfrew, which remains the property of that burgh. The ferries at Erskine and Renfrew are for passenger and vehicular traffic combined, and are carried on by boats worked by steam on two chains laid across the river.

The act of 1904 also defined anew the harbour of Glasgow, the limits being Albert Bridge (formerly Hutchesontown Bridge), and a line drawn across the river at a specified point which is about four miles below Glasgow Bridge.

The Renfrew Act of 1899² authorised the extension of the municipal and police boundaries, and enacted, *inter alia*, that the town council might (1) make and maintain a tidal dock or basin, being an enlargement or extension of the existing harbour of Renfrew, 15 acres or thereabouts in extent, and a pier or jetty on the south of the intended tidal dock or basin, with subsidiary works; and (2) divert into the harbour and dock the waters of the Pudzeoch stream and the Clyde. Except as by the act expressly authorised, the rights of the Trustees of the Clyde Navigation, the Clyde Pilot Board, and the Commissioners of Northern Lighthouses were reserved.

Before action had been taken by Renfrew to carry into effect the provisions of their act of 1899, in so far as regarded the harbour works thereby authorised, the time allowed for the compulsory purchase of lands for, and the completion of, the works had expired, but was extended by the act 2 Edward VII., c. 51 (1902). It had also been recognised that the general interests of the public and the special interests both of the Clyde Navigation and of Renfrew would be promoted

¹ 4 Edward VII., c. 242.

² 62 and 63 Victoria, c. 214.

by the Renfrew undertaking being transferred to and vested in the Trustees of the Clyde Navigation. An agreement was accordingly entered into with all the parties interested to effect this object, and a bill was promoted in parliament, in the session of 1904-5, to carry the arrangement into effect. The act which followed forms the *twenty-fifth* Clyde Trust act.¹ By it the agreement between the Trustees of the Clyde Navigation and Renfrew was confirmed; the Renfrew harbour undertaking was transferred to these trustees, and the works authorised by the Renfrew Act, 1899, and the Renfrew Act, 1902, were abandoned; and the Renfrew harbour undertaking was declared to form part of the undertaking of the trustees. By this arrangement, and by another with the corporation of Glasgow whereby the trustees acquired lands at Braehead in exchange for a portion of Shieldhall as a site for sewage works, the trustees became possessors of the whole river frontage from Linthouse to Renfrew, over two miles in length. Subsequent purchases were made south of Renfrew Road, and through these combined acquisitions the trustees now hold about 400 acres of land suitable for future extension of the dock accommodation of the port.

In the same year (1905) a *twenty-sixth* act,² which set forth in its preamble that it was expedient to amend the constitution of the Clyde Navigation Trust so as to make the trustees more fully representative of the persons interested in the harbour and commerce of Glasgow and the river Clyde, altered the constitution of the trust by increasing the number of the trustees to forty-two, of whom eighteen were appointed to be chosen—ten by the Corporation of Glasgow, two by the County Council of Lanark, one by the County Council of Dumbarton, one by the Town Councils of each of the burghs of Govan, Partick, Dumbarton, Renfrew, and Clydebank. Six were appointed to be chosen—two by the Chamber of Commerce of Glasgow, two by the Merchants' House of Glasgow, two by the Trades' House of Glasgow; and eighteen (called "the elected trustees") by the shipowners and payers of harbour rates. The act further contained provisions as to the tenure of office of the elected trustees, the time of their election, their rotation, their qualification, and other provisions. Hitherto the lord provost of Glasgow had been the chairman, *ex officio*, but under the act the chairman is to be elected by the trustees annually.

During the years 1905-6 improvements were made in the lighting of the river, and the lights now comprise two lighthouses, four light towers, five beacon lights, and 12 lighted buoys, or a total of 23 lights, with distinguishing characteristics for the north and south sides of the river respectively. The lights burn Pintsch's compressed gas, purchased from the Clyde Lighthouses Trust, who possess a gas-work at Port-Glasgow. The lights burn night and day.

Of the quays authorised by the 1904 act, the first to be constructed was that

¹ The Clyde Navigation Act, 1905. 5 Edward VII., c. 33.

² The Clyde Navigation (Constitution) Act, 1905. 5 Edward VII., c. 100.

at Merklands, 525 yards in length, completed in 1907. On the ground behind the western portion of the quay, a timber depot of about 9 acres has been laid out, while the eastern portion, $7\frac{1}{2}$ acres in extent, has been leased to the Glasgow corporation in the capacity of local authority, as a site for the foreign animals lairage and slaughter-houses, which were brought into use in May, 1907. The construction of the quay at Merklands brought about a widening of the river at this place to the extent of about 70 feet.

At Yorkhill, one of the authorised diversions of Pointhouse Road has been carried out; the new quayage is under construction, and will, when completed, provide additional berthing to the extent of about 1,150 yards.

Of the river widenings authorised by the 1904 act, a portion of that at Blythswood, and the whole of that at Inchinnan have been carried out, also that on the north side of the river immediately east of Erskine Ferry.

At Dalmuir the Clyde Trustees had established workshops and slips for repair of the dredging plant, but Messrs. Wm. Beardmore & Co. being desirous to add the ground to their great shipbuilding yard, the property was sold to them. This necessitated the trustees providing accommodation elsewhere, and extensive workshops and slips are now (1907) approaching completion at Renfrew, immediately east of the Pudzeoch, on the Elderslie ground purchased under the 1905 act.

In the year 1906 two interesting events in the history of the Clyde were the launch of the Cunard liner "*Lusitania*," the largest vessel in the world at the time, and the launch of H.M.S. "*Agamemnon*," the largest war vessel ever built on the river.

In 1907 the *twenty-seventh* Clyde Trust Act,¹ consisting of the confirmation of a Provisional Order, was obtained. By this Order the trustees were authorised to acquire lands at Meadowside, in the burgh of Partick, and to construct thereon a wall, and the borrowing powers of the trustees were likewise increased by £650,000, making £8,500,000 in all. This quay wall, the construction of which is to be expedited as much as possible, will be about 537 yards in length, and will probably be devoted, in part at least, to the accommodation of vessels engaged in the grain trade.

It has often been observed that the variety of the industries which are prosecuted in Glasgow gives it an immense advantage over towns which are practically dependent upon one industry—cotton or jute, sugar or flax, &c. It rarely happens that extreme depression occurs in all industries at the same time. In this variety of traffic the harbour of Glasgow participates and is largely sustained. But that fact necessitates provision being made for the conduct of such various departments as river passenger traffic, channel traffic, coasting traffic, coal traffic, ore traffic, the Atlantic steamers, foreign and colonial trades, the timber trade, the cattle trade, and others. The large shipping companies have berths specially appro-

¹ The Clyde Navigation Order Confirmation Act, 1907 (7 Edward VII., c. 61).

priated to them, but these may be used when vacant for other vessels. The total length of quays in use at the present time (1908) is 16,500 yards, 2,054 yards are under construction, and 537 yards are authorised. Out of the total length of 16,500 yards of quays, 3,975 yards are devoted to the coal and ore trades, 961 yards to the timber trade, 183 yards to the cattle trade, 7,875 yards to companies having appropriated berths, 592 yards for fitting-out berths at large cranes, and the remaining 2,914 yards are used for general and occasional traders.

APPENDIX

I.—TABLE SHOWING REVENUE OF THE CLYDE NAVIGATION TRUST IN EACH YEAR
FROM 1770 TO 1908.

	£ S. D.		£ S. D.		£ S. D.
1770	147 0 10	1808	5,472 0 9	1846	51,198 12 2
1771	1,044 10 0	1809	5,407 9 8	1847	59,017 2 9
1772	1,220 1 9	1810	6,676 7 6	1848	60,621 8 1
1773	1,494 1 0	1811	4,755 3 8	1849	59,034 14 1
1774	1,454 4 4	1812	4,597 19 7	1850	64,234 14 11
1775	402 3 8	1813	5,169 13 9	1851	68,875 4 9
1776	1,984 0 7	1814	5,275 6 11	1852	76,077 9 4
1777	1,397 0 7	1815	5,902 2 8	1853	77,919 18 6
1778	1,733 19 5	1816	5,843 7 8	1854	86,580 5 11
1779	1,540 1 8	1817	7,028 0 7	1855	73,943 9 1
1780	1,515 8 4	1818	7,732 18 11	1856	74,995 7 9
1781	1,721 5 8	1819	7,386 2 10	1857	82,797 10 7
1782	1,420 16 8	1820	6,328 18 10	1858	78,783 17 6
1783	1,450 16 8	1821	8,070 2 2	1859	90,816 17 7
1784	1,120 0 0	1822	7,984 3 8	1860	97,983 18 1
1785	3,256 18 10	1823	8,380 16 4	1861	105,768 11 0
1786	1,980 14 10	1824	8,555 0 0	1862	111,493 10 2
1787	1,975 16 4	1825	8,367 11 7	1863	118,083 7 10
1788	2,064 5 9	1826	16,204 6 6	1864	121,380 13 9
1789	2,153 15 6	1827	14,316 15 9	1865	121,587 11 11
1790	2,239 0 4	1828	17,669 14 10	1866	125,787 10 0
1791	3,175 14 1	1829	20,194 10 4	1867	131,892 2 6
1792	2,739 5 7	1830	20,296 18 6	1868	143,840 17 3
1793	2,840 17 11	1831	18,932 0 7	1869	150,136 4 5
1794	2,936 14 11	1832	22,496 0 3	1870	164,093 2 10
1795	2,836 5 9	1833	21,578 5 2	1871	164,188 18 7
1796	3,649 14 4	1834	22,859 14 10	1872	174,200 12 2
1797	3,182 6 0	1835	33,676 16 3	1873	182,906 15 2
1798	3,199 1 6	1836	37,544 5 5	1874	192,127 16 11
1799	3,233 18 3	1837	37,644 16 0	1875	196,326 18 10
1800	3,319 16 1	1838	39,030 1 0	1876	198,526 19 6
1801	3,400 10 9	1839	47,879 11 10	1877	208,732 1 0
1802	4,085 15 11	1840	46,536 14 0	1878	217,100 0 3
1803	4,640 16 10	1841	49,665 15 7	1879	211,501 11 8
1804	4,193 7 7	1842	40,678 16 8	1880	223,709 0 8
1805	4,065 10 5	1843	43,301 2 0	1881	248,061 14 0
1806	4,299 14 3	1844	41,286 18 8	1882	264,549 8 3
1807	5,000 5 9	1845	45,869 10 11	1883	283,998 8 5

APPENDIX

I.—TABLE SHOWING REVENUE.—*Continued.*

	£ S. D.		£ S. D.		£ S. D.
1884	291,182 4 11	1893	368,497 18 10	1901	444,077 3 0
1885	291,658 4 11	1894	371,976 17 7	1902	458,845 9 7
1886	282,912 1 3	1895	353,813 6 2	1903	497,868 18 5
1887	287,933 17 9	1896	405,518 6 10	1904	517,491 9 5
1888	311,495 1 6	1897	410,190 9 9	1905	513,547 18 2
1889	331,492 18 9	1898	430,327 6 4	1906	528,569 4 3
1890	356,202 11 3	1899	427,943 6 8	1907	547,861 19 6
1891	354,580 11 8	1900	441,419 10 6	1908	556,965 15 6
1892	369,226 6 5				

II.—TABLE SHOWING REVENUE COLLECTED AT CUSTOMS, GLASGOW, AND OF SHIPS
BELONGING TO GLASGOW REGISTERED.

Years ended.	Duties.	No. of Ships.	Tonnage.
January 5, 1796	£125 13 0½
„ 1801	469 13 6½
„ 1806	1,322 7 11½
„ 1810	...	24	1,956
„ 1812	3,124 2 4½	35	2,620
„ 1815	8,300 4 3½	59	4,829
„ 1820	11,000 6 9	77	6,131
„ 1821	16,147 17 7
„ 1825	41,154 6 7	111	14,084
„ 1830	59,013 17 3	217	39,432
„ 1831	68,741 5 9
„ 1835	270,667 8 9	297	54,335
„ 1840	427,564 0 0	403	185,707
„ 1841	526,100 0 11	431	95,062
„ 1845	551,851 2 5	472	111,620
„ 1848	610,978 0 0
„ 1850	640,568 7 9	507	137,909
„ 1851	675,044 0 0	508	145,684
„ 1852	653,283 0 0	500	156,064
„ 1853	652,664 0 0
„ 1854	688,602 3 8	568	182,845
„ 1855	668,556 9 4	601	192,895
„ 1856	718,835 0 1	597	211,226
„ 1857	752,597 14 4	569	207,942
„ 1858	801,894 0 0	628	224,750
„ 1859	814,142 5 2	647	225,608
„ 1860	883,971 10 0	660	212,028
„ 1861	924,445 10 0	679	218,804
„ 1862	955,760 19 11	701	235,430
„ 1863	983,690 10 3	741	262,418
„ 1864	967,263 16 11	780	296,665
„ 1865	788,956 17 9	815	329,752
„ 1866	933,057 9 5	807	332,333
„ 1867	1,202,097 4 9	834	352,595
„ 1868	1,112,065 0 0	858	378,458
„ 1869	1,185,753 19 10	884	403,456
„ 1870	963,534 10 7	892	428,262
„ 1871	999,572 9 7	895	433,016

APPENDIX

II.—TABLE OF REVENUE.—*Continued.*

Years ended.	Duties.	No. of Ships.	Tonnage.
January 5, 1872	£1,033,181 10 6	897	436,179
„ 1873	1,056,301 5 9	900	442,405
„ 1874	972,792 9 9	900	475,279
„ 1875	960,854 8 10	932	523,831
„ 1876	1,022,825 14 7	1,000	586,587
„ 1877	1,016,112 1 9	1,088	652,154
„ 1878	945,860 0 0	1,130	700,007
„ 1879	954,620 15 5	1,183	760,913
„ 1880	969,339 7 4	1,207	776,780
„ 1881	1,036,865 0 0	1,258	827,435
„ 1882	1,071,587 0 0	1,321	920,726
„ 1883	1,050,155 0 0	1,379	979,707
„ 1884	1,064,283 0 0	1,428	1,018,476
„ 1885	1,082,147 0 0	1,453	1,069,505
„ 1886	1,078,673 0 0	1,445	1,062,385
„ 1887	1,012,051 0 0	1,487	1,141,037
„ 1888	1,074,872 0 0	1,533	1,178,720
„ 1889	1,160,114 0 0	1,549	1,224,022
„ 1890	1,341,435 0 0	1,571	1,274,021
„ 1891	1,392,953 0 0	1,576	1,316,809
„ 1892	1,479,869 0 0	1,607	1,363,748
„ 1893	1,551,201 0 0	1,634	1,405,064
„ 1894	1,671,338 0 0	1,689	1,522,299
„ 1895	1,685,593 0 0	1,670	1,525,326
„ 1896	1,668,836 0 0	1,665	1,536,051
„ 1897	1,757,920 0 0	1,677	1,594,020
„ 1898	1,748,822 0 0	1,667	1,586,743
„ 1899	1,720,768 0 0	1,668	1,630,170
„ 1900	1,952,910 0 0	1,605	1,582,229
„ 1901	1,998,308 0 0	1,586	1,606,852
„ 1902	2,283,935 0 0	1,620	1,636,678
„ 1903	2,109,799 0 0	1,615	1,666,934
„ 1904	1,965,254 0 0	1,641	1,622,819
„ 1905	1,955,760 0 0	1,639	1,730,062
„ 1906	1,939,474 0 0	1,680	1,853,880
„ 1907	1,928,102 0 0	1,682	1,947,687
„ 1908	1,839,881 0 0	1,700	1,957,391

III.—TABLE SHOWING NUMBER AND TONNAGE OF SHIPS ARRIVING AT THE HARBOUR
OF GLASGOW.

Year.	SAILING SHIPS.		STEAM VESSELS.		TOTAL.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tonnage.
1828	4,405	214,315	7,100	481,946	11,505	696,261
1831	4,005	186,576	7,537	545,751	11,542	732,327
1840	5,337	271,942	11,149	894,387	16,486	1,166,329
1841	5,785	314,262	9,421	828,111	15,206	1,142,373
1850	5,857	391,033	9,195	873,159	15,052	1,265,192
1851	6,212	424,785	11,062	1,021,821	17,274	1,446,606
1854	6,322	504,008	11,880	1,090,804	18,202	1,594,812
1856	5,779	445,976	11,804	1,227,120	17,583	1,673,096
1857	5,762	439,409	12,808	1,173,182	17,960	1,612,681
1858	5,506	451,364	12,640	1,113,527	18,146	1,564,891
1859	5,414	440,607	12,403	1,104,182	17,817	1,544,789
1860	4,502	415,715	11,476	1,033,154	15,978	1,448,869
1861	4,804	474,740	11,281	1,029,480	16,085	1,504,220
1862	4,573	478,189	11,291	1,052,453	15,864	1,530,642
1863	4,620	491,797	10,555	1,035,982	15,175	1,527,779
1864	4,569	483,305	9,962	1,044,934	14,531	1,528,239
1865	4,499	457,774	11,856	1,261,284	16,355	1,719,058
1866	4,113	463,736	12,612	1,400,464	16,725	1,864,200
1867	3,732	448,419	11,433	1,334,453	15,165	1,782,872
1868	3,711	482,168	11,710	1,366,970	15,421	1,849,138
1869	3,452	475,653	12,255	1,440,804	15,707	1,916,507
1870	3,372	502,517	12,712	1,489,593	16,084	1,992,110
1871	3,087	461,009	12,713	1,588,699	15,800	2,049,708
1872	3,337	462,972	12,125	1,665,407	15,462	2,128,379
1873	3,116	395,800	11,517	1,800,401	14,633	2,196,201
1874	2,870	369,267	11,176	1,832,154	14,046	2,201,421
1875	2,768	423,553	11,213	1,826,304	13,981	2,249,857
1876	2,816	431,522	11,770	1,866,554	14,586	2,298,076
1877	2,866	471,873	11,997	1,956,743	14,863	2,428,616
1878	2,727	457,290	13,210	2,154,733	15,937	2,612,023
1879	2,213	393,681	14,052	2,286,876	16,265	2,680,557
1880	1,862	321,721	14,948	2,350,478	16,810	2,672,199
1881	1,948	369,563	15,815	2,687,970	17,763	3,057,533
1882	1,825	288,859	15,468	2,760,378	17,293	3,049,237
1883	1,794	327,686	15,857	2,972,014	17,651	3,299,700

III.—TABLE SHOWING NUMBER AND TONNAGE OF SHIPS.—*Continued.*

Year.	SAILING SHIPS.		STEAM VESSELS.		TOTAL.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tonnage.
1884	1,576	292,825	16,298	3,068,362	17,874	3,361,187
1885	1,385	259,296	15,454	2,941,362	16,839	3,200,658
1886	1,302	250,354	14,576	2,822,118	15,873	3,081,472
1887	1,279	234,954	15,047	2,883,561	16,326	3,118,515
1888	1,340	221,440	15,466	3,116,230	16,806	3,337,670
1889	1,268	223,850	15,632	3,186,741	16,900	3,410,591
1890	1,244	240,405	15,401	3,256,443	16,645	3,496,848
1891	1,280	239,334	14,855	3,135,775	16,135	3,375,109
1892	1,193	249,272	14,736	3,376,626	15,929	3,625,898
1893	1,137	178,780	14,374	3,336,487	15,511	3,515,267
1894	993	178,535	15,083	3,600,006	16,076	3,778,541
1895	913	143,642	14,479	3,523,422	15,392	3,667,064
1896	960	158,572	15,430	3,789,910	16,390	3,948,482
1897	712	128,731	15,728	3,953,321	16,440	4,082,052
1898	653	150,750	16,333	4,165,558	16,986	4,316,308
1899	567	124,446	15,558	4,234,292	16,125	4,358,738
1900	547	125,765	15,352	4,235,832	15,899	4,361,597
1901	585	108,641	14,696	4,276,782	15,281	4,385,423
1902	552	133,877	14,934	4,555,711	15,486	4,689,588
1903	520	133,060	15,147	4,969,223	15,667	5,102,283
1904	484	118,924	15,020	5,220,831	15,504	5,339,755
1905	533	127,206	15,554	5,343,800	16,087	5,471,006
1906	509	113,473	15,492	5,447,254	16,001	5,560,727
1907	458	96,521	15,939	5,703,770	16,397	5,800,291
1908	436	125,808	15,856	5,882,958	16,292	6,008,766

ERRATA.

- Page 95, footnote, for "Blaen's" read "Blaeu's."
 , , 125, line 13, for "James VI." read "James VII."
 , , 148, " 21, delete "Stewart."
 , , 162, " 12, for "1715" read "1716."
 , , " 13, for "iminent" read "eminent."
 , , 175, footnote, after "29 George II., c. 20," insert "(1755)."

INDEX

A B C table of customs, 48.

Abercorn, earl of, 94.

Aberdeen, proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45, 133, 161.

— ship belonging to, 44.

Abernethy, bishop of Caithness, 88.

Acts of parliament relating to burghs and trade : 1466 (cc. 1 and 2), 14 ; 1471 (c. 10), 14 ; 1488 (c. 12), 16, 24 ; 1503 (cc. 32, 36), 18 ; 1503 (c. 37), 19 ; 1535 (c. 18), 14 ; 1555 (cc. 14, 28), 23 ; 1555 (cc. 26, 37), 24 ; 1563 (c. 24), 26 ; 1567 (cc. 3, 4), 25 ; 1567 (c. 56), 26 ; 1581 (c. 27), 31, (cc. 15, 26), 33 ; 1587 (c. 80), 35, (cc. 109, 114, 131), 36 ; 1592 (cc. 74, 76), 38, 39 ; 1600 (c. 57), 47 ; 1606 (c. 36), 57 ; 1607 (c. 15), 57, 58, (c. 13), 60 ; 1640 (c. 19), 87 ; 1641 (cc. 103, 119), 88 ; 1645 (c. 171), 90 ; 1647 (c. 197), 91 ; 1661 (c. 277), 103, (c. 279), 110 ; 1662 (c. 3), 103 ; 1663 (c. 9), 125 ; 1672 (c. 5), 112 ; 1681 (c. 4), 125 ; 1689 (cc. 4, 28), 125 ; 1690 (c. 15), 128, 149, (c. 18), 127, (c. 59), 128, (c. 103), 110 ; 1695 (cc. 61, 73), 148 ; 1696 (c. 85), 148 ; 1698 (c. 38), 149, (c. 39), 150.

— for improvement and navigation of river Clyde, (1759) 177 ; (1770) 180-1 ; (1809) 193-4 ; (1825) 199-201 ; (1840) 205-7 ; (1846) 207 ; (1854) 209 ; (1857) 210 ; (1858) 210 ; (1864) 214 ; (1868) 215 ; (1870) 216-7 ; (1873) 218 ; (1878) 219 ; (1883) 220 ; (1884) 221-2 ; (1887) 222 ; (1888, 1890) 223 ; (1891, 1894, 1897) 225 ; (1899) 226 ; (1904) 230 ; (1905) 231 ; (1907) 232.

Africa, traders to, 169.

“Agamemnon,” war vessel launched, 232.

Aird, John, provost of Glasgow, 158, 160.

Albany, John, duke of, 18.

Alexander II., King, 6 ; charters by, 2, 3, 7, 9.

Alexander III., King, 6 ; charters by, 2, 10.

Allan, the Steward, son of, 4.

Alloa (Alloway), 179.

Alston, W. M., engineer of Clyde Trust, 177, 205-6.

America, traders to, 169-70.

American war, 184-5, 199.

Amsterdam, ship from, 83.

Anchorage dues, 13.

Anderson, John, mason in Ayr, 155.

— John, merchant, Glasgow, 159.

— John, of Dowhill, 126, 129.

— William, of Dovehill, 89.

Anderston, village of, 194.

Angus, complaint of commissioners of, against Dundee, 61.

Angus, earl of, 94.

Anne, Queen, charters and grants by, 154 ; Union in reign of, 157.

Antigua, trading to, 167.

Antwerp, trade with, 12, 22.

Arbroath, 15.

Arbuckle, William, 140.

Archangell, trade to, 154.

Ardmore, 114.

Argyll, 18 ; trading to, 9, 10.

Argyll family, 24.

— earl of, 89.

— Archibald, earl of, 28, 30.

— marquis of, 90, 99.

Armour, James, 118.

Arnot, James, merchant, Edinburgh, 83.

Arran, 195.

Arran, James, earl of, governor, 25.

Atlantic, crossing, 82.

Ayr, burgh of, 3, 7, 18, 31, 132.

— markets of, 11, 16, 90.

— trade of, with Isles, 23.

— fishings of, 23, 48.

— ship of, 29.

— salt bought at, 30, 89.

— claims between, and Irvine, 33.

- Ayr, bridge of, 39, 40.
 — port of, 43, 73.
 — impost granted to, 46.
 — complaint by, as to condition of Clyde, 48.
 — visit of Sir William Brereton to, 85.
 — representation of, in parliament, 94.
 Ayr, water of, 72.
 Ayrshire ports, 32, 169.
- Bacon, Sir Francis, 52.
- Balliol, John, King of Scotland, 7.
- Baltic provinces, trading with, 50, 179.
- Bannatyne, James, of Kellie, 114.
- Barbadoes, trading to, 95, 167.
- Barns of Clyde, lands of, 226.
- Barter of provisions for merchandise, 23.
- Beaton, James, archbishop of Glasgow, 25, 44, 47.
- Beith, 138.
- Bell, Henry, 195.
 — James, merchant, 83, 89.
 — Patrick, merchant, 89.
- Benefices, annexation of church, 35, 36, 50, 68, 88.
- Berwick, fermes of, 3.
 — one of the Four Burghs, 5.
- Bishopforest, 13, 14.
- Blackhill, laird of, 151.
- Blackstane, Renfrew, 13, 78, 91.
- Blaeu's map, 95.
- Blair of Blair, 42, 50.
- Blankschew of Bretagne, 29.
- Blantyre, Lord, 212.
- Blantyre, Walter, commendator of, 36, 40, 41, 43.
- Blythswood, widening river at, 230, 232.
- Boats, good, for Clyde, 88.
- Book, Robert, minister of Abbey parish, Paisley, 188.
- Bordeaux, 45, 83.
- Bornes, 47, 65.
- Borrowstounness, 135, 169.
- Borthwick, James, deacon of surgeons, Edinburgh, 96.
- Boston, trading to, 167.
- Bowling bay, 177, 189, 193, 207, 210.
 — harbour of, 225.
- Boyd, lord, 42.
- Boyd, Robert, mason, 117.
- Boyle, lord, 123, 151.
- Braehead, lands of, 229.
- Brechin, bishop of, 88.
- Brereton, Sir William, 85.
- Bretagne, ship from, 29.
- Bridge. *See* Glasgow.
- Bristol, merchants of, 167.
- Brittany, ship built in, 17.
- Brodick, in Arran, 195.
- Broomielaw, market at, 44.
 — boat seized at, 46.
 — vessels coming to, 58, 59, 85, 181, 184.
 — clearing river at, 63, 171.
 — pier and port of, 63, 103, 153, 162, 167-8, 176-8; extension of harbour, 167-9, 181, 200.
 — buying herring at, 98.
 — rules and dues payable at, 144-5.
 — revenue of harbour, 180-1.
 — depth of water at, 180, 186, 201.
 — *See* Glasgow, port and harbour of.
- Brown, Thomas, mason, 172.
- Bruges, 12, 20.
- Buchan, John, agent of convention, 131, 138, 150.
- Bucklie, Richard, 122.
- Burgesses, privileges of, 5, 6, 8.
- Burghs of barony and regality, 9, 32, 33.
 — formerly held of churchmen transferred to crown, 35.
 — royal burghs prejudiced by, and arrangements between, 59, 75, 76, 111-3, 127-33.
 — communication of trade to, 138-9, 148-53, 159-60, 170.
- Burghs, royal, privileges of, 5, 8, 14, 16, 18, 19, 24; (1563) 26; (1581) 31; (1592) 38, 39; (1596 *et seq.*) 43, 59, 60, 79, 80, 91, 111-3, 127, 129-33, 170.
- charter by David II. to, 8, 91; charters by Queen Mary and James VI. to craftsmen of, 24, 25, 31.
 — supervision of, 12.
 — taxation of, 36.
 — poverty of, 48, 132, 149, 159.
- Burghs, court of Four, 5.
 — convention of. *See* Convention.
- Burns, Thomas, minister of Renfrew, 187.
- Bute, earl of, 176.
 — marquis of, 196-7.
 — family of, 186.
- Bute, Kyles of, 32.
- Island of, Tucker's report, 95.
- Bute, sheriff of, 106.
- Caithness, bishop of, 88.
- Cambuskenneth, monks of, 4.
- Campbell, bishop, of the Isles, 88.
 — Colin, of Blythswood, 83, 89.
 — Daniel, 153.
 — Hugh, of Terrinzeane, 42.
 — James, bailie, 101.
 — James, of Blythswood, 186.
 — John, of Lundy, 21.

- Campbell, Matthew, 153.
 Campbeltown, steamers to and from, 196.
 Campvere, 12, 20.
 Canal, Forth and Clyde, 178-80, 207.
 — Monkland, 179-80.
 See also Cart river.
 Canaries, trade to, 154.
 Cantyre (Kintyre), 78 ; mull of, 95.
 Cardross, 2.
 — ferry at, 212.
 — Burn, 211.
 — Mains of, 62.
 Carron, 179.
 Cart, river, 35 ; navigation of, 172, 186-8,
 202-4, 207, 209, 212-4, 218, 220, 223-4.
 — — bridge over, 44.
 — Black, river, 70.
 Cartsdyke (Crawfordsdyke, Cartsburn),
 pier and port at, 82, 108, 135-6, 145,
 151.
 — population of, 86.
 — lands of, 109.
 — anchorage dues at, 163.
 — shipbuilding at, 167.
 Castlemilk, laird of, 151.
 Cathcart, lord, 175, 189.
 Causeways of burghs, 68.
 Chamberlain, great, supervision of burghs,
 12.
 Charles I., King of Scotland, letters and
 charters by, 72, 78, 82, 84, 91, 109.
 — attempt of, to impose episcopacy, 89.
 Charles II., King of Scotland, 92 ; letters
 and charters by, 98, 107-9.
 — Restoration of, 101.
 Charles IX., King of France, 26.
 Chatelherault, duke of, 25, 34.
 Clark, John, mason, 103, 117.
 — Mr., superintendent of river, 198.
 Cloch and Clochstane, 66, 70, 84, 146.
 — lighthouse, 85, 176, 224.
 Cluny park, Dumbarton, 77.
 "Cluthas," river steamers, 228.
 Clyde, clearing and deepening channel of,
 (1556) 21, 28 ; (1600) 46 ; (1612 *et seq.*)
 66, 69, 79, 80, 85, 91, 169, 171, 175-8,
 180-1, 193-4, 198, 200-1, 205-7, 209-10,
 223.
 — fishings in, 2, 3, 23, 24, 33, 61, 66, 72.
 — justices of, 33.
 — sanding of, 45, 46, 65, 71.
 — against pollution of, 48, 49, 60, 61.
 — instructions to water sergeant, 53.
 — against putting stones or ballast in,
 53, 60, 63.
 — virtual coming to, 58.
 — inspection of, by Henry Crawford, 66.
 Clyde, new haven of, 79.
 — water bailie and sergeants of, 83, 102-3.
 — good boats for, 88.
 — floods in, 162, 186, 189, 193.
 — shipping of, 167, 170. *See Ships.*
 — map of, by John Watt, 170.
 — reports by engineers on, 177, 180, 186,
 192, 198.
 — acts of parliament for improvement of,
 177. *See Acts of parliament.*
 — survey of, by William Kyle, 190.
 — towing path on, 192, 197.
 — dredging of, 193, 198.
 — widths of, from Glasgow to Dumbarton
 and Greenock, 193, 197, 219, 229, 230.
 — introduction of steamboats on, 195-6.
 — "Clutha" steamers on, 228-9.
 Clyde Trust, revenue of, 186.
 — harbour transferred to, 194-5.
 — constitution of, 199, 206, 211, 231.
 — limits of, 211.
 — table showing revenue of, 235-6.
 Clydebank wharf and dock (Rothesay
 Dock), 225, 226, 228.
 Cochrane, lord, of Dundonald, 94, 98,
 106-7.
 Colquhoun, John, of Luss, 77.
 — William, in Kilpatrick, 80.
 "Comet" steamboat, 195.
 Commonwealth, 93, 99.
 Conservator of Scots privileges in Nether-
 lands, 6, 12, 18, 19, 22, 43.
 Convention of Burghs, 5, 21, 38.
 — records of, 28, 86, 133.
 — acts of, for preserving burgh privileges,
 32, 33, 91.
 — authority by, to sell lands, 117.
 Corse, John, 118.
 — William, 129, 153.
 Couper, James, shoresman, Port-Glasgow,
 163.
 Covenanters, Dumbarton Castle occupied
 by, 89.
 Cowlairs (Kows lair), 117.
 Craftsmen, privileges of, 8, 14, 51, 112 ;
 charters by Queen Mary and King
 James VI. as to, 24, 25, 31.
 — from Flanders, 15.
 Crawford, earl of, 109.
 — Henry, from Culross, 66.
 — John, 29.
 — — bailie at Port-Glasgow, 128.
 — Sir John, of Kilbirnie, 82, 109.
 — dame Margaret, 108.
 — Thomas, 109 ; of Auchinames, 82.
 Crawfordsdyke. *See Cartsdyke.*
 Crinan canal, 195.

- Cromwell, Oliver, lord protector, 92 ;
 ordinance of, 94 ; death of, 99.
 — Richard, lord, protector, 99.
- Crown, annexation to, of church benefices,
 35, 36.
- Culburgh (Kelburn), Tucker's report on,
 95.
- Culross, 66.
- Cumbernauld, 136.
- Cumbræ (Cumbray), 32.
- Cumbræ (Combray), Little, ship at, 29.
 — creek at, 43, 147.
 — lighthouse on, 175, 224.
 — pilots of vessels from, 212.
- Cumbræheads (Combraeheads), 143.
- Cunningham, bailliary of, 169.
 — barony of, 7.
 — "county" of, 57.
- Cunningham, Frederick, 129.
- Gabriel, bailie of Glasgow, 74.
- Cupar, monks of, 4.
- Custom house at end of Glasgow bridge,
 48.
- Customs and anchorage dues, 13.
- Customs exacted at Glasgow bridge, 61,
 62.
- Customs, collection of, 46, 48, 96, 97.
 — table of, 48, 101.
 — tacksmen of, 57.
 — King's, 24, 57, 141.
- Customs and Excise, collection of, 94, 96,
 97, 141.
 — table showing revenue collected, 237-8.
- Dalmuir, 91, 179, 230.
 — workshops at, 232.
- Dalmuir wharf, 222.
- Dantzig, trading to, 169.
- Darien scheme, 82, 148, 155.
- Darnley, earldom of, 34.
- David I, King, 3, 5.
- David II, King, charters by, 2, 8, 91.
- Deas, James, engineer of Clyde Trust,
 177, 223.
- Deboshit men and vagabonds, 40, 41.
- Defoe, Daniel, 168, 178-9.
- Dieppe, trade to, 24.
- Ducket (Dowcat) Green, Glasgow, 162, 168.
- Dumbarton, burgh of, 16 ; privileges of,
 in Clyde, 1, 2, 12, 13, 29.
 — charters to, by Alexander II, 2, 63.
 — — by Alexander III, 2, 10, 63.
 — — by David II, 2, 63.
 — — by James VI, 63, 79.
 — castle of, 2, 30, 34, 46, 89, 101, 177.
 — fairs and markets of, 2.
 — ranking of, 3.
- Dumbarton, claims of, against Glasgow,
 9, 14.
 — indenture between Renfrew and, 12.
 — indenture between Glasgow and, 17.
 — kings' ships at, 2, 17, 18, 21.
 — shipping of, 45, 65, 97, 188-9.
 — harbour of, 18, 20, 43, 49, 65, 94, 107,
 114, 142, 148-9, 213, 220.
 — legal proceedings between Glasgow and,
 1, 17, 58, 66, 76, 81, 98, 104-6, 181-3.
 — arrangements and common action be-
 tween Glasgow and, 34, (1590) 37,
 (1592) 39, (1600 *et seq.*) 47, 48, 59, 70,
 75, 78, 86, 88, 96-101, 104-6, 115, 117,
 128, 152-3, 199, 200, 202, 205, 207, 212.
 — complaints of, against Glasgow, 40, 50.
 — complaints of, against Renfrew, 50, 70,
 78.
 — complaint of, against Ayr, 89.
 — arrangements between Renfrew and,
 17, 20, 30, 40, 70, 78, 88, 89.
 — work of, in deepening river, 21, 69.
 — proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45,
 96, 133.
 — trading of, with Isles, 23, 31.
 — fishings of, and by, 23, 67.
 — inundations of, by river Leven, 33, 39,
 40, 45, 47, 49, 53, 56, 57, 62, 70, 77,
 81, 102.
 — contributions to, by other burghs, etc.,
 33, 49, 102, 122-3, 153-4, 171.
 — bailies of, justices of Clyde, 34.
 — complaint of, against Kirkcudbright,
 39.
 — exemptions of, from attendance at
 conventions, 39, 40.
 — imposts applied for and levied by, 40,
 45, 46, 47, 56, 57, 70, 77, 81.
 — licence to, to feu lands, 49.
 — applications of, for assistance, 53, 102.
 — absence of, from convention, 56.
 — taxation in aid of, and accounts of
 expenditure, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 66, 67,
 69.
 — convention at, 59.
 — elections of magistrates and council of,
 59.
 — attack by inhabitants of, on Glasgow
 burgesses, 60.
 — Bishop's water gang at, 62.
 — drowned lands at, 63.
 — seizure of ships by, 73, 77.
 — complaint of Glasgow fleshers against,
 76.
 — acts of parliament to, 79, 89, 90, 102.
 — proceedings of, against forestallers and
 regulators, 80.

- Dumbarton, customs of, 81, 82, 83.
 — visit of Sir William Brereton to, 85.
 — opposition of, to Glasgow charter, 86.
 — tolbooth at, 89.
 — movement of, against Episcopacy, 89.
 — relief to, from assessment, 91.
 — protest by, as to Inveraray, 93.
 — representation of, in parliament, 94, 158.
 — Tucker's reference to, 95.
 — report on condition of, 136-7, 153, 204.
 — imports of, 141.
 — dues payable by, at Port-Glasgow, 146.
 — opposition of, to Union, 156.
 — population of, 176, 191, 194, 198, 209.
 — revenues of, 188.
 — width of Clyde at, 193, 197.
 — shipbuilding at, 213.
 — harbour trust of, 220.
 Dumbuck ford, 21, 66, 177, 180-1, 186.
 Dumfries, burgh of, 3, 48.
 Dunbar, battle of, 92.
 Dunbar, Gavin, archbishop of Glasgow, 25.
 Duncan, Andrew, engineer, 210.
 Dundas, Mr., M.P., 179.
 Dundee, 2, 38.
 — proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45, 133.
 — ship belonging to, 44.
 — prisoners in, 54.
 — ladle dues at, 61.
 — convention at, 91.
 Dundonald, lord Cochran of, 94, 98, 106-7.
 — laird of, 111.
 — family, 172.
 Dunfermline, 15.
 Dunfermline, earl of, 56.
 Dunglass, 2; Castle, 180.
 Dunkeld, bishop of, 88.
 Dunlop, Alexander, merchant, 60.
 — Sir Nathaniel, chairman of Clyde Trustees, 208, 215-6, 220.
 Dunoon, 176.
 Dutch ships, 65, 75, 77, 104, 106, 159, 169.
 East Seas, imports from, 153.
 Edinburgh, 18, 20, 46; liberties and customs of, 2.
 — fermes of, 3.
 — one of the Four Burghs, 5.
 — proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45, 162, 168.
 — contract between, and Antwerp, 22; commission from, to Dieppe and Rouen, 24.
 — guildry of, 41.
 Edinburgh, elections in, 53.
 — measures kept by, 62.
 — imprisonment at, 74, 91.
 — bishop of, 88.
 — tolbooth of, 91.
 — conference at, between Glasgow and Dunbarton, 152.
 Edgar, King, 6.
 Edward I., King of England, 7.
 Eglinton, earl of, 138, 175.
 — master of, 42.
 Elderslie, plantations of, 192.
 — widening of river at, 219.
 — proposed dock on lands of, 226.
 — ground at, 232.
 Elderslie rock, removal of, 209-10, 229.
 Elections of magistrates and council, 59.
 Elizabeth, Queen, 50.
 Elphinstone, Sir George, provost, 37, 54; of Blythswood, 72.
 — William, merchant, 11.
 Emperor, renewal of privileges in Flanders with, 21.
 England, alliance against, 7, 15.
 — ships captured on coast of, 20.
 — trading with, 50, 95, 101, 125, 141, 158.
 — parliament of, 94.
 — tobacco merchants of, 167.
 English ships, trading in, 167.
 Episcopacy, abolition and restoration of, 35, 36, 55, 86, 87, 88, 89, 103, 125, 128.
 Erskine (Arskin), 95.
 — ferry at, 181, 201, 212, 230.
 Europe, traders to, 169-70, 185.
 Ewing, Robert, merchant, Greenock, 171.
 Ewing & Robertson, merchants, Greenock, 171.
 Excise and customs, settlement of, 94.
 Exports, early, 12, 19.
 — against export of victuals, 23.
 Fairlie, bishop, of Lismore, 88.
 Fairlie (Fairly), Tucker's report on, 95.
 Fallisdail, Thomas, 56.
 Faulds, Archibald, merchant, 169.
 Ferries, 201, 229. *See Cardross, Erskine, Govan, Renfrew, Stobcross, Whiteinch.*
 Ferry boats in harbour, 212.
 Fife, complaint of shire of, against Dundee, 61.
 Fisheries and manufactures, board of, 178.
 Fishery, royal, 78, 110. *See Royal.*
 Fishing industry, development of, 14.
 Fishing, pearl, 72.
 Fishings in Clyde, 2, 3, 23, 33, 34.

- Fishings in Lochfyne and other lochs, 23.
 Flanders, trade with, 12, 20, 21, 26, 72, 169.
 — weavers from, 15.
 Fleming, Michael, citizen of Glasgow, 20.
 Flemings, fleet seized by, 23.
 Flodden, 18.
 Forestalling and regrating, 80.
 Forfar, commissioner of, 38.
 Forsyth, Matthew, protocol book of, 20.
 Fort William, 195.
 Forth and Clyde. *See* Canal.
 Foulis, James, of Colinton, 22.
 France, alliance with, 7.
 — league with, 42.
 — ships to and from, 14, 18, 20, 26, 44.
 — trading with, 26, 46, 50, 85, 95, 97, 107, 137, 141, 154, 159, 169, 178.
 Franck, Richard, memoirs of, 97.
 Freisland merchant, 73.
 Frenchman with a venture ship, 64.
 Frost, vehement, 62.
- Galbraith, Malcolm de, 82.
 Galbraiths, owners of Greenock, 82.
 Galloway, bishop of, 88.
 Galloway, mull of, 78.
 Garbrandston, Peter, merchant, 73.
 Garnock river, 42, 219.
 Garvel point, 219.
 Gibraltar, trading to, 167.
 Gibson, Walter, merchant, 159, 169.
 Gilhagie, John, merchant, 153.
 Gilmour, Walter, & Co., 107.
 Girvan, water of, 72.
 Glasgow, burgh of, founded, 1.
 — charters to, by William the Lion, 1.
 — — by Alexander II., 2, 9.
 — — Alexander III., 10.
 — — Robert I., 10.
 — — Robert III., 10.
 — — James II., 13.
 — — James III., 14.
 — — James IV., 14.
 — — Queen Mary, 65.
 — — James VI., 27, 28, 65, 68, 71.
 — — Charles I., 84-87, 102.
 — — Charles II., 108.
 — — King William and Queen Mary, 125-6.
 — acts of parliament to, confirming charters, etc., 79, 90, 102, 108.
 — fair of, 1, 9, 123.
 — privileges of, in Clyde, 1, 9, 29, 65, 66, 84, 85.
 — markets and fairs of, 1, 9, 10, 38, 58, 59, 61, 84.
- Glasgow, claims and complaints of Dumbarton against, 9, 14, 40, 50, 76, 77.
 — complaints of, against Dumbarton, 40, 63, 70, 76.
 — encroachments by Renfrew and Rutherglen against, 13, 21, 33, 42.
 — questions with Rutherglen, 28, 29, 61, 62.
 — questions with Renfrew, 30, 50.
 — barony and regality of, 13, 25, 34, 36, 50, 72, 97, 123.
 — archbishop of, 44, 47.
 — archbishopric of, 17, 88.
 — temporalities of archbishopric and chapter, etc., 36, 37, 40, 41, 47, 50, 86, 88.
 — university of, 13, 69, 79.
 — cathedral of, 46, 48, 68, 86.
 — legal proceedings between Dumbarton and, 17, 58, 66, 73, 74, 76, 81, 98, 99, 104-6, 181-3.
 — arrangements and common action between Dumbarton and, 34, 39, (1590) 37, (1600 *et seq.*) 47, 59, 63, 75, 78, 86, 88, 96-101, 104-6, 115, 117, 128, 152-3. *See* Dumbarton.
 — building of a galley at, 18.
 — bridges of, 21, 27, 28, 38, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 68, 69, 71, 91, 181, 189, 212, 220.
 — exaction of custom at bridge, 61, 62.
 — customs and excise collected at, 96, 97, 141, 237-8.
 — proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45, 96, 133, 160-2, 168.
 — fishings of and by, 23, 67.
 — trading of, with Isles, 23, 95.
 — population of, (1560) 25, (1600 *et seq.*) 48, 65, 101, 160, 169, 176, 178, 185-6, 189, 191, 194, 198, 207, 209, 217, 220, 225.
 — rental of, 160, 197, 209, 217, 220, 225.
 — references to, by travellers, etc., (Hardyng) 27; (Sir William Brereton) 85; (Franck) 94, 97; (Tucker) 95; (Jorevin de Rocheford) 103; (John Ray) 103; (James Brome) 108-9; (Thomas Kirk and Ralph Thoresby) 118; (Thomas Morer) 126-7; (Defoe) 168, 178-9; (Richard Pococke) 178; (Pennant) 181.
 — customs and dues payable to, 27, 28, 29, 49, 61.
 — records of, 28.
 — magistrates of, justices of Clyde, 32.
 — elections of magistrates and council of, 53-56, 71, 79, 86, 87, 126-7.
 — Laigh Kirk of, 38.

- Glasgow, ladle and other dues levied by, 38, 59.
 — complaint of, against Kirkeudbright, 39.
 — against pollution of Clyde, 48.
 — complaint of, against Ayr, 39, 40.
 — dean of guild and guildry of, 41, 51, 71.
 — port and harbour of, 44, 59, 107, 176 (*see also* Broomielaw, Port-Glasgow), 189, 193, 194-5, 197, 200-1, 208, 217, 220, 225.
 — ships belonging to, 44, 45, 161.
 — shipping of, 103, 134, 190, 193-4, 197, 239-40.
 — register of ships, 107, 118, 237-8.
 — imposts applied for and granted to, 45, 46, 63, 69, 71.
 — imposts on ale and beer, 140, 162.
 — contributions to, 156, 159.
 — Green of, 45, 46, 160.
 — market cross of, 46.
 — castle of, 47, 48, 50.
 — ports or gates of (Ratounraw and Kirk), 48, 68.
 — dues lifted by, on herrings, 49, 73.
 — merchants and craftsmen of, 53, 57, 71, 89, 90, 153-4, 167, 169.
 — obligation by merchants of, as to Port-Glasgow, 139-40, 155.
 — riots in, 54, 55.
 — absence of, from convention, 56.
 — attack by Dumbarton inhabitants on burgesses of, 60.
 — causeways of, 68.
 — tenandry of Ratonraw, 68.
 — subdeanery of, 68.
 — crafts hospital of, 69.
 — visit of James VI. to, 71.
 — complaint of fleshers of, against Dumbarton, 76.
 — water bailie and water sergeants of, 83.
 — representation of, in parliament, 94, 158.
 — vessels belonging to, 96, 97, 141.
 — manufactures of, 107, 153-4.
 — proceedings and arrangements between Greenock and, 113-5, 118-21.
 — authority to sell common lands of, 117, 132, 168.
 — report on condition of, 124-5, 132-5, 140, 153, 161, 168-9.
 — imports and exports of, 141, 167, 169-70.
 — tobacco lords, 167.
 — fire in Saltmarket of, 153.
 — opposition of, to Union, 156, 158.
- Glasgow, revenues of, 188.
 — trade and shipping of, 199.
 — construction of docks at harbour of, 193, 206-7, 214-6, 218, 220-1.
 — graving docks, 215, 223.
 — limits of harbour, 220, 230.
 — railways to docks, 227, 228.
 — quayage and traffic at harbour of, 232-3.
 — table showing ships belonging to, 237-8.
 — table showing number and tonnage of ships arriving at, 239-40.
- Glasgow, earl of, 123.
 Glencairn, earl of, 57, 141.
 Golborne, John, report and works by, on Clyde, 180-1, 186, 201.
 Gourock, 111, 136, 141.
 — anchorage dues at, 163.
 — harbour of, 176.
 Govan, boats at, 103.
 — ferry at, 181, 201, 210, 226, 229.
 — quayage extending to, 217.
 — docks at, 220, 223.
 Graham, bishop, of Orkney, 88.
 Greenock, parish of, 151.
 — Easter and Wester, 82, 108-9.
 — mills of West, 172.
 — port and harbour of, 32, 80, 81, 82, 148-9, 154-5, 160, 172, 183-4, 189, 191-2, 204, 207-8, 213-4, 220.
 — burgh of barony of, 80, 81, 82, 109-10, 171-4.
 — proceedings and arrangements between Glasgow and, 113-5, 117, 118-21.
 — clachan of New Kirk of, 51, 52.
 — unfree traders in, 59, 72, 96, 119-21, 128, 135-6.
 — communication of trade to, 130-1.
 — laird of, 78, 80. *See* Shaw.
 — feuing of, 86.
 — population of, 86, 171.
 — Tucker's report on, 95.
 — residents of, burgesses of other burghs, 102.
 — Royal Fishery Closs of, 111. *See* Royal.
 — ratification by parliament to, 121, 184.
 — custom house at, 141, 160, 171.
 — customs receipts at, 171, 183, 191.
 — imports and exports of, 141, 169.
 — condition of, 154.
 — anchorage dues at, 163, 183.
 — feuars of, 171-2.
 — charters by Sir John Shaw and successors to feuars of, 172-4, 183-4.
 — jurisdiction of magistrates of, 174.
 — baileys of, 175.
 — population of, 176, 194, 198.
 — shipping at, 183-4, 189-90, 194, 197.

- Greenock, graving dock at, 187.
 — harbour dues of, 190.
 — acts of parliament to, 191.
 — report by municipal commissioners on, 204.
 — municipal and parliamentary boundaries of, 207.
 — reconstruction of quays at, 222.
- Gryff (Black Cart) river, 70.*
- Guilds, early, 6, 8.
- Guthry, bishop of Moray, 88.
- Hakluyt's voyages, 12.
- Hall, George, burgess of Dumbarston, 83.
- Halyburton's Ledger, 6, 12, 19.
- Hamburg, 179.
- Hamilton, 120, 135.
- Hamilton, lord advocate, 52.
- Hamilton, marquis of, 90.
 — duke of, 102, 123.
 — lord Claud, 106.
- Hamilton, Frederick, 118.
 — James, 101.
 — Sir James, of Rosehall, 170.
- Hamilton Hill, 179.
- Harding, John, visit of, 11.
- Helensburgh, 195.
- Henloupen, ship from, 73.
- Henrik, shipmaster, 83.
- Herrings, 3, 4.
 — fishing for, 23, 67.
 — assize, 24.
 — custom on, 62, 73, 76.
 — export of, 67, 88.
 — retailing of, 98.
- Highland host, 124.
- Highlands, West, trade to, 9.
 — injury to inhabitants of, 40, 41.
- Hirsts or sandbanks, 21.
- Holland, trading with, 50, 106-7, 126, 141, 167, 179.
- Holy Isle, 32.
- Holyrood, abbey of, 3.
- Hope, Sir Thomas, King's advocate, 83.
- Houston, 136.
 — laird of, 29.
 — parish of, 151.
- Houston, Helen, 82, 90.
- Hughes, William, report by, on river Cart, 202.
- Hunter, John, mason, 163.
- Ibrox railway, 227.
- Imports, early, 12, 19.
- Inchgreen, port of, 73, 83, 88, 105.
- Inchinnan, widening river at, 230, 232.
- Inchinnan bridge, 187-8.
- Innes, Cosmo, 3, 5, 6.
- Innocent VIII., Pope, 17.
- Inveraray, burgh of, 93, 99, 102.-
- Inverkip, 136, 151.
- Inverness, burgh of, 132.
- Ireland, trading with, 50, 95, 141, 143, 167.
- oak trees from, 117.
- Irvine, barony of, 7.
 — burgh of, 16.
 — ranking of, 3.
 — letters and charters to, by Alexander II., 7.
 — — Robert I., 7.
 — — Robert II., 7.
 — — Robert III., 7.
 — — James I., 7.
 — — James IV., 20.
 — — James VI., 28, 29, 48.
 — — James VII., 125.
 — formerly the port of Glasgow, 7 ; (bailliary of Cunningham), 169.
 — claim by, as to Ayr market, 11.
 — claims between Ayr and, 33.
 — proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45, 96, 133, 162, 167.
 — trade of, with Isles, 23.
 — fishings of, and by, 23, 48, 67.
 — letters of protection by earl of Argyle to, 28.
 — ship at port of, 29.
 — customs of, 29.
 — stent rolls of, 30.
 — reference to, by Bishop Leslie, 29 ; Timothy Pont, 57 ; Sir William Brereton, 85 ; Thomas Tucker, 96 ; Richard Pococke, 178.
 — trading to, 31.
 — bridge of, 33, 37, 148, 172, 201.
 — river of, 42, 148, 225.
 — harbour of, 36, 37, 42, 43, 50, 61, 62, 68, 111, 155, 201-2, 215, 216-7, 219.
 — complaint of, against Kirkcudbright, 39.
 — exemptions of, from attendance at conventions, 39.
 — Seagate castle at, 42.
 — imposts applied for and granted to, 42, 43, 46, 61, 62, 68, 70.
 — harbour of, at Little Cumbrae, 43, 147-8.
 — contributions for support of, 48, 111, 155, 167.
 — unfree traffickers in, 57.
 — common good of, 67.
 — ratifications to, by parliament, 90.
 — representation of, in parliament, 94.

- Irvine, vessels belonging to, 96.
 — report on condition of, 125, 132-4, 137-8,
 167, 201.
 — population of, 176, 191.
 — trustees for managing harbour of, 201-2,
 215.
 — limits of harbour of, 219.
 — roads and streets of, 225.
 Irvine Water, 72, 219, 225.
 Isles, suppression of rising in, 17.
 — bread and provisions to, 23.
 — fishing in lochs of, 23.
 — trading to, 31, 65, 73, 95.
 — injury to inhabitants of, 40, 41.
 — bishop of, 88.
- Jamaica, trading to, 167.
 Jamaica St. bridge, 181.
 James I., King, 5.
 — charters by, 7.
 James II., King, 5.
 — letters and charters by, 3, 11, 13.
 James III., King, 5.
 — letters and charters by, 14, 16.
 — ship purchased by, 17.
 James IV., King, ships of, 2, 17, 18.
 — letters and charters by, 14, 16, 17, 20.
 — visit of, to Isles, 17.
 — navy of, 17.
 — trade during reign of, 19.
 James V., King, ships of, 18.
 — charters by, 21.
 James VI., King, 44.
 — accession of, 27; accession of, to English
 throne, 50.
 — letters and charters by, 27, 28, 29, 31,
 33, 36, 41, 42, 48, 50, 53-56, 63, 65,
 68, 69, 70, 71, 79.
 — visit of, to Scotland, 71.
 James VII., King, 124.
 — letters and grants by, 125.
 Joceline, bishop of Glasgow, 1.
 John, bishop, 14.
 Johnston, George, Port-Glasgow, 162.
 Jordanhill, laird of, 29.
 Jouffroy, marquis de, 195.
- Kelburn (Kelly burn) foot, pier at, 79.
 — Tucker's report on, 95.
 Kelso, monks of, 3, 4.
 Kelvinhaugh, quay at, 230.
 Kelvin Pott, 144.
 Kelvin, water of, 63, 179, 193, 213.
 — limit of harbour, 208.
 Kennedy, James, of Culleane, 72.
 Kilbarchan, 136.
 Kilbirnie, lands of, 109.
- Kilbirny, lady, 108.
 Kilmacolm, clachan of, 51, 52.
 — unfree traders in, 59, 72, 96, 136.
 — parish of, 108.
 — disjunction of Port-Glasgow, 141. *See*
 Port-Glasgow.
 Kilmarnock, 138.
 Kilmarnock (Kilmarnock), 136.
 — laird of, 147.
 Kilmaurs, 138.
 Kilpatrick, 34.
 — church of, 20.
 — customs at, 78, 95, 141.
 — regrating at, 80.
 — trading at, 136.
 Kilpatrick, Old, bill promoted by, for
 construction of docks, 225-6.
 Kilpatrick sands, 180.
 Kilwinning, 138.
 Kintyre, 78. *See* Cantyre.
 Kirkeudbright, burgh of, 16, 31.
 — impost levied by, 39, 40.
 — ladle dues at, 61.
 Kirkintilloch, 136, 179.
 Kyle, William, surveyor, 190.
 Kyles of Bute, 32.
- Ladle duty, 38, 61.
 Laing charters, 64.
 Lamlash, ship at, 29.
 Lanark, one of the Four Burghs, 5.
 — complaint of, against Glasgow, 38.
 — stone weight kept by, 62.
 Lanark, magistrates of, justices of Clyde,
 33.
 — representation of, in parliament, 94.
 Langbank, 230.
 Langedrein, 70, 91.
 Langside, battle of, 34.
 Largs, 138.
 — steamboats to and from, 196.
 Lauderdale, earl of, 89, 101.
 Leith, ship built at, 17.
 — sailing from, 18, 21.
 — harbour of, 70.
 Lennox, trading to, 9.
 Lennox, Matthew, earl of, 27.
 — duke of, 34, 40, 41, 48, 50, 53, 62, 72,
 79, 85, 86, 87, 97, 102, 123.
 Leslie, bishop, 35.
 Leven river, fishings in, 263.
 — inundations of Dumbarton by, 33, 39,
 45, 47, 49, 53, 56, 57, 62, 70, 77, 81,
 102.
 — bridge over, 122, 147.
 — deepening channel of, 213.
 Liddell's Bog, Glasgow, 117.

- Lighthouses and other lights, 175-6, 224, 231.
 — Trust, 175-6, 217, 221.
 — channel of river improved by trustees, 219-20.
 — works of, 224-5.
 Lindsay, archbishop of Glasgow, 88.
 — bishop of Edinburgh, 88.
 — bishop of Dunkeld, 88.*
 Lindsay, Margaret, 109.
 — Patrick, 82, 109.
 Linlithgow, fermes of, 3.
 — one of the Four Burghs, 5.
 — measures kept by, 62.
 — order of, in tax roll, 133.
 Linthouse, widening of river at, 219.
 Lismore, bishop of, 88.
 Liverpool, import of tobacco from, 129.
 — trade to, 198.
 Livingston, Sir William, of Kilsyth, 36.
 Lochfyne, fishings in, 23.
 — trading at, 95.
 Lochgoil, 34.
 Lochlong, 34, 63.
 Lochs, fishings in, 23, 34.
 Locke, Joseph, engineer, 208.
 Logan, engineer, report by, on Clyde, 201.
 London, commissioners sent to, 53, 54, 56, 114, 126.
 — merchants of, 167.
 — trading to, 167, 170, 179.
 Lorne, Archibald, lord of, 81, 84.
 "Lusitania," launch of, 232.
 Lyon, George, 146.
 — John, shoremaster, Port-Glasgow, 163.
 Macfarlan, Duncan, minister of Renfrew, 205.
 Mackenzie, T. R., General Manager of Clyde Trust, 177.
 Madairies, trade to, 154.
 Malcolm IV., King, 6.
 Manchester, 141.
 Manufactures, 107, 153-4.
 Mar, earl of, regent, 27.
 — secretary of state, 160.
 Maritime jurisdiction, 198.
 Marlborough, duke of, 126.
 Marlingford, 70, 91, 154, 177.
 Marres, lands of, 42.
 Mary, Queen of Scots, 22, 44.
 — sailed to France, 18.
 — letters and charters by, 24, 25, 65.
 — abdication of, 27.
 Mary, Queen, and King William. *See* William.
 Maryhill, 179.
 Maryland, trading with, 167, 185.
 Maxwell, bishop, of Ross, 88.
 — Patrick, of Newark, 72; Sir Patrick, 108, 117.
 Measures and weights, 62.
 Merchants, early, 5, 6, 11, 72.
 — privileges of, 8, 14, 51, 112.
 Merchants' House of Glasgow, 8, 51.
 Merklands, quay at, 230, 231-2.
 Middleburgh, 12, 20, 22.
 Monk, General, 101.
 Monkland Canal. *See* Canal.
 Montgomery, Hugh and James, 153.
 Montrose, convention at, 40.
 Montrose, duke of, 123.
 Moray, James, earl of, regent, 27, 34.
 Morer, Thomas, 126-7.
 Morton, James, earl of, regent, 27, 29.
 Municipal corporations, reports by commissioners on, 201, 204-5.
 Mure, Robert, 60.
 Mурroch, lands of, 2.
 Navigation laws, 61, 103-4, 106-7.
 Netherlands, trading to, 12, 18, 19.
 Newark, port of, 29, 72, 77, 88, 105, 136.
 — laird of, 29, 72.
 — ships at, 45, 72.
 — Tucker's report on, 95.
 — lands at, acquired for port, 108, 141, 160. *See* Port-Glasgow.
 — bay of, 151.
 — burgh of barony of, 160.
 Newark Castle, 211.
 Newbottle, monks of, 2.
 Newburgh, 15.
 Newmilns, 138.
 Newport. *See* Port-Glasgow.
 New York, steamers to, 209.
 Newsands, 91.
 Newshot, 230.
 Nicholas V., Pope, 13.
 Norway, trading with, 95, 137, 169.
 Nushet Island, 180.
 Obies, Jacob, merchant, 75.
 Orkney, bishop of, 62, 88.
 — earl of, 69.
 Oxford, Glasgow streets like, 103.
 Packing and peiling, 34.
 Painter, David, secretary to Queen Mary, 22.
 Paisley, lord, 34, 39.
 Paisley, monks of, 4, 15.
 — monastery of, 15.
 — abbot and commendator of, 34.

- Paisley, temporalities of abbey, 34, 35, 39, 94.
 — burgh of, 15, 16, 99, 106-7.
 — trading privileges of, 19, 93, 135-6.
 — reference to, by Bishop Leslie, 35.
 — bridge over river Cart at, 44.
 — charter to, by James IV., 15.
 — — by James VI., 44.
 — — by keepers of Commonwealth, 93.
 — — by Charles II., 98, 107.
 — population of, 44, 172, 176, 186, 191, 194, 198.
 — against Renfrew levying custom in, 19, 93, 98.
 — market and fairs, 94.
 — quota of tax roll on, 151.
 — condition of, 154, 207.
 — great fire in, 172.
 — navigation of river Cart to, 172-3, 186-8, 202-4, 207, 209, 218, 221, 223-4.
 Palmer, John, bailie of Dumbarton, 20.
 Partick (Perthie), 4.
 — shipping at, 191.
 — quays at, 230, 232.
 Partick wharf, 230.
 Pearl fishing, 72.
 Peebles, burgh of, 132.
 Pennant's Tour in Scotland, 2, 181, 183.
 Perth, proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45, 133.
 — treaty of, 35.
 — elections in, 53.
 — prisoners in, 54.
 — complaint by shire of, against Dundee, 61.
 Pestilence, 32.
 Pilot Board and licensing of river pilots, 200, 207, 212-3, 222-3, 224.
 Pittenweem, 48.
 Pococke, bishop, tour of, in Scotland, 178.
 Pointhouse ford, 180.
 — road, 230, 232.
 Poland, trading to, 169.
 Pont, Timothy, 57.
 Port Dundas, 179.
 Port-Glasgow, lands acquired for port and harbour of, 108.
 — loading and unloading vessels at, 114, 116-7, 139-42, 155.
 — additional land acquired at, for houses, etc., 116-7.
 — works at harbour of, 116-7, 163, 170.
 — propositions as to shipping, 116-7.
 — entry of ships at, 118.
 — bailies of, 128, 166-7, 175.
 — great lodging at, 138.
 — lease of Glasgow's interest in, 138.

- Port-Glasgow, obligation by Glasgow merchants as to loading and unloading at, 139-40, 142.
 — custom house at, 141-2, 160.
 — disjunction and erection of parish of, 141.
 — rules and dues payable at road and harbour of, 142-4, 145-7, 153, 163, 164-7.
 — weights and measures at, 145.
 — kirk and minister of, 147.
 — post to, 153.
 — extension of, 160.
 — export of herrings from, 162, 185.
 — imports and exports of, 169.
 — officer at, 166-7.
 — thirlage to mills of, 170.
 — plans of, 170.
 — dry dock at, 178.
 — management of harbour of, 183, 202.
 — contract with feuars of, 184-5.
 — parliamentary constitution, 185.
 — other acts of parliament to, 191, 202, 214, 222, 224.
 — shipping at, 185, 189, 191, 194, 197.
 — steamboat built at, 195.
 — report by municipal commissioners on, 204.
 — parliamentary burgh of, 204.
 — ferry at, 212.
 — gaswork of Lighthouse Trust at, 231.
See also Newark.
 Pot of the Rig (Potterig), 65, 105.
 Postmaster at Glasgow, 153.
 Provan, lands of, 108, 132.
 Pudzeoch stream, 226, 230, 232.
 Railways at docks, 227, 228.
 Rankine, James and Thomas, Greenock, 119-21.
 Rashielee, 230.
 Ray, John, naturalist, 103.
 Reformation, period of, 25, 158.
 Regraving and forestalling, 80.
 Renfrew, burgh of, 16, 38.
 — charters to, by Robert I., 70.
 — — Robert III., 4, 21.
 — — James V., 21.
 — — James VI., 29, 69, 70.
 — — Charles I., 91.
 — — Queen Anne, 154.
 — lands and fishings of, 3, 4, 21, 30, 70, 78, 90, 91, 98, 154.
 — ranking of, 3.
 — mill of, 4, 98.
 — baron of, 4.
 — barony of, 21.

- Renfrew, indenture between Dumbarton and, 12.
 — arrangements and complaints between Dumbarton and, 17, 20, 30, 40, 47, 70, 78, 79, 88, 89.
 — encroachment by, against Glasgow, 13, 21, 33, 42.
 — no privilege of, in Paisley, 19, 93, 98.
 — work of, in deepening river, 21, 69.
 — proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45, 96, 133, 161-2.
 — quota of tax roll on, 151.
 — reference to, by Bishop Leslie, 30.
 — — by Bishop Pococke, 178.
 — arrangements between Glasgow and, 30.
 — contract between, and earl of Argyll, 30.
 — trading to, 31, 205.
 — magistrates of, justices of Clyde, 33.
 — exemptions of, from attendance at conventions, 39, 56.
 — application of, to convention for support, 40.
 — protest of, against impost to Glasgow, 45.
 — imposts applied for and granted to, 45.
 — complaints of, against Glasgow, 49, 73.
 — proceedings by, against unfreemen, 59, 71, 72, 94, 96, 102.
 — Islands of, 70.
 — ratification to, by parliament, 89.
 — representation of, in parliament, 94, 158.
 — vessels belonging to, 96, 205.
 — report on condition of, 135-6, 205.
 — imports and exports of, 141.
 — port and harbour of, 142, 187, 219.
 — dues payable by, at Port-Glasgow, 146.
 — population of, 176, 187, 194, 198.
 — ferry at, 181, 193, 201, 210, 212, 230.
 — canal at, 186-7.
 — alteration of river course at, 187.
 — bleachfield and works at, 187.
 — revenues of, 188.
 — towing path between Glasgow and, 192.
 — widening of river at, 219.
 — act of parliament to, authorising dock, 226, 230.
 — transfer of undertaking to Clyde Trust, 230-1.
 — Clyde Trust workshops and slips at, 232.
 Renfrewshire, sheriff court of, 174.
 Rennie, John, report of, on Clyde, 189, 193, 201.
 — harbour at Greenock designed by, 192.
 Revolution of 1688, 124-5.
 Riddell, James, sailor, shoremaster, 166.
 Robert, bishop, 14.
 Robert I., King, ships of, 2.
 — charters by, 10.
 Robert II., King, charters by, 3, 7.
 Robert III., King, 5.
 — charters by, 7, 11.
 Rochedore, Jorevin de, 103.
 Rochelle, 45, 141.
 Rodger, Robert, provost of Glasgow, 158-9.
 Roseneath, 24.
 Ross, bishop of, 88.
 Ross, lord, 77.
 Rothesay, charters to, by Robert III., 11.
 — — James VI., 31.
 — trading to, 31.
 — proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45, 96, 162.
 — castle of, 11.
 — privileges and possessions of, 31, 32.
 — arrears due by, 39.
 — exemptions of, from attendance at conventions, 39, 56.
 — representation of, in parliament, 94.
 — Tucker's report on Bute, 95.
 — rental of, 96.
 — form of elections of, 96.
 — riot on magistrates, etc., of, 106.
 — port and harbour of, 106, 164, 176, 186, 196-7, 198, 201, 214.
 — expedition from, to Darien, 155.
 — report on condition of, 137, 163, 170.
 — contributions to, 164, 170, 186, 193.
 — custom house at, 176.
 — shipping of, 193.
 — steamboats at, 196.
 — maritime jurisdiction of, 198.
 — act of parliament to, (1831) 201.
 — population of, 201.
 — report by municipal commissioners on, 205.
 — development of, 214.
 Rothesay Dock at Clydebank, 228.
 Rouen, trade to, 24.
 Roxburgh, one of the Four Burghs, 5.
 Royal Burghs. *See Burghs.*
 Royal Fishery Closs, 111; sets and sale of Glasgow's property in, 138, 171.
 Royal Fishery Society, 78, 110-1.
 Russell, John Scott, report of, on Clyde, 201.
 Rutherglen, burgh of, 16.
 — charters to, by David I., 3.

- Rutherglen, charters to, by William the Lion, 3.
 — — by Robert I., 3.
 — — by Robert II., 3.
 — — by James V., 21.
 — — by James VI., 70.
 — fermes of, 3.
 — encroachment by, against Glasgow, 13, 21, 33, 42.
 — questions between, and Glasgow, 28, 29, 61, 62.
 — proportion of, in tax roll, 22, 23, 45, 96, 133, 162.
 — exemptions of, from attendance at conventions, 39, 56, 96.
 — grants by burghs to, 45, 154.
 — tolbooth and causeways of, 45, 46.
 — guildry of, 70.
 — ratification to, by parliament, 90.
 — representation of, in parliament, 94, 158.
 — fairs of, 102.
 — petition of, to parliament, 102.
 — report on condition of, 125, 132-4.
 — population of, 176, 191.
 — revenues of, 188.
 — tides above, 197.
- St. Andrews, archbishopric of, 17, 88.
 St. Enoch's (Tennochis) burn, 168.
 St. Kitts, trading to, 167.
 St. Martins in France, 107, 159, 169.
 Salmon, export of, 46.
 Salmon fishings, 3, 4, 30, 63, 66, 90, 91.
 Saltcoats, 42.
 — boatmen from, 46.
 — Tucker's report on, 95.
 Sand eels, taking of, 48.
 Schedenston, cross of, 3.
 Scots-French alliance, 7.
 Scotstoun, widening of river at, 219.
 Scott, Robert, minister, 63.
 Semple, lord, 34.
 — John, provost of Dumbarton, 84, 89.
 Shaw, John, of Greenock, 82, 86, 90, 109.
 — Sir John, 82, 109, 119-21, 130, 141, 148, 151-2, 171-3.
 — John Stewart, of Greenock, 175.
 — lady, 82.
 Sheills, Thomas, in Port-Glasgow, 151.
 Shieldhall, lands at, 229.
 — wharf and dock, 222, 226.
 Shipbuilding, early, 2, 17, 18.
 Shipping. *See Navigation.*
 Ships, early, on Clyde, 2, 17, 18, 20.
 — freighting of, in free burghs, 16, 24, 31.
 Ships, victualling of, 23.
 — seizure of, 29, 30, 46, 73, 77, 83, 84, 89, 90, 91, 98, 99, 114.
 — shipping in 1597, 44; in 1595-1657 *et seq.*, 45, 103-4, 107, 167, 175, 237-8.
 — boats on Clyde, 88.
 Sidserf, bishop, of Galloway, 88.
 Simpson, William, 169.
 Smeaton, John, reports by, on river Clyde, 177, 180, 201; on Forth and Clyde Canal, 178-9.
 Smollett, George, burgess of Dumbarton, 40.
 — Sir James, 151.
 Smyth, an Englishman, 46.
 Sneddon bridge, 188.
 Snyp, Robert, cooper, 163.
 Sound, imports from the, 153.
 Southesk, earl of, 89.
 — David, earl of, 84.
 Spain, trading to, 169.
 Spanish ships, 20.
 — salt, 89.
 Spiers, Alexander, of Elderslie, 186.
 Spottiswood, archbishop, 88.
 Staple ports for Scottish trade, 12, 18, 19, 20.
 Steam navigation, introduction of, 195-6, 197.
 — development of, 217.
 Stevenson, Francis, wright, 142.
 Stewart (Stuart), Sir Archibald, of Blackhall, 82.
 — Sir James, lord provost of Edinburgh, 96.
 — Sir John Shaw, of Greenock, 183.
 — Sir Mathew, of Minto, 37, 54.
 — Robert, of Barscub, 90.
 — Sir William, 62, 89.
 Stewarton, 138.
 Stirling, 34, 47, 169.
 — one of the Four Burghs, 5.
 — elections in, 53.
 — measures kept by, 62.
 — order of, in tax roll, 133.
 Stobcross ferry, 219, 229.
 Stockholm, imports from, 159.
 — trading to, 167.
 Stockingfield, 179.
 Stockwell St. bridge, 181.
 — *See Glasgow*, bridges of.
 Straits, trading to the, 167.
 Sweden, trading to, 169.
 Symer, William, 169.
- Tail of the Bank, 225.
 Tailyeour, James, merchant, 151.

- Tarbert, 2, 95.
 Tax roll of burghs, 22.
 Telford, Thomas, report by, on Clyde, 192-3, 201.
 Thomson, John, clerk of Glasgow, 74.
 — Robert, postmaster, 153..
 Tobacco, offer of, 122.
 — imports of, 129, 161, 167, 178-9, 185.
 Toward point, lighthouse on, 176, 224.
 Trade, early, 6, 11, 12.
 — with France, 7.
 — with Flanders, 12, 18, 19, 20, 21.
 — during commonwealth, 93.
 — before and after Revolution, 125-6,
 153-4.
 — communication of, to unfree burghs,
 130, 138-9, 148-51, 159-60, 170.
 — stagnant, 154.
 Traquair, John, earl of, 84, 86.
 Tron, privilege of, 15.
 Troon, harbour at, 61, 62.
 Tucker, Thomas, inspection and reports
 by, 94, 95, 96.
 Turnbull, Matthew, merchant, 169.
 Unfreemen, against traffic with or by,
 24, 26, 43, 57, 60, 70, 94, 96, 112-22,
 128.
 Union of crowns, 50, 52.
 Union of England and Scotland, 52, 93,
 106, 126, 148, 156-8, 167.
 Ure, John F., engineer, 210.
 Victuals, against export of, 23.
 Virginia, trading with, 167, 169, 185.
 Wales, Prince of, 4 ; Prince and Princess
 of, 227.
 Walker, James, report by, on Clyde, 201.
 Walkinshaw, James, 153.
 — William, 153.
 Walter, bishop of Glasgow, 9.
 Walter, son of Allan, 4 ; steward of Scot-
 land, 15.
 Water sergeant, instructions to, 53.
 Waterford, Ireland, 117.
 Watt, James, 108.
 — memorials of, 170.
 — report by, on Clyde, 180.
 — survey of canals by, 180.
 — John, mathematician, 170.
 Weights and measures, 62.
 West India ships, 161.
 West Indies, 170.
 West Seas, dwellers at, 23.
 — fishings in, 24, 95, 161.
 Westminster, parliament at, 94.
 Whale fishing, 107.
 Whidbey, Mr., report by, on river Clyde,
 198.
 Whiteinch, ferry at, 226, 229.
 — river steamers to, 229-30.
 Whitworth, Robert, engineer, 179, 187.
 Whytfoord, bishop, of Brechin, 88.
 Wigton, burgh of, 16, 31.
 Wigton, earl of, 54.
 Wilkie, John, commissioner to parliament,
 94.
 William, bishop of Glasgow, 9, 10.
 William the Lion, King, charters by,
 1, 3.
 — assize of, 6.
 William, King, and Queen Mary, 125-6 ;
 letters and charters by, 126-7.
 Windmillcroft, dock at, 194.
 Wischard, Robert, bishop of Glasgow, 10.
 Withers, Mr., 120.
 Wood, John, of Port-Glasgow, 195.
 Yochill, bay of, 154.
 Yorkhill, quay at, 230, 232.
 Young, John, merchant, 169.

