

Trades House of Glasgow

Index of Occurrences of Disputes in and among Incorporations



By

Craig R Bryce M.Sc., M.Ed., F.R.S.A.
Trades House Honorary Archivist

MMXVII

Trades House of Glasgow

Index of Occurrences of Disputes in and among Incorporations

The following index was created to support new Deacons and Visitors in finding something interesting to say either about their own Incorporation or one that they would be visitors at. It was designed to be accessed as a digital book, but can be printed out if the reader prefers.

The index derives from the two books “Records of the Trades House of Glasgow 1605 to 1678” and “1713 to 1777” by Harry Lumsden, Clerk to the Trades House of Glasgow. Volume 1 is available at www.tradeshousemuseum.org and Volume 1 and 2 are available from the Trades House Library, by appointment via the librarian.

The first indexed section is organised by date of the event and the second section is in complainant order. The file is in P.D.F. format and this allows the reader to search and copy text and to paste the section copied into Microsoft Word.

The House archivist and librarian are always happy to assist Deacons and Visitors in their research for new and interesting stories to recite at their Dinners.

If you spot an error or typo, or have any suggestions for improvement please let the archivist know and he will update the document for future users.

Index by Date Order

Complainant	Against	Debate	Location	Date
Masons	Wrights	Masons complaining that the Wrights had filled a void (possibly an old doorway) and carried out slating on a roof. Ruling: Wrights told to desist	Volume 1, Page 27	June 1610
Bonnetmakers	Last Deacon	For injuring the Deacon and withholding the crafts ben and garttaines. Ruling: Last Deacon was fined and had to ask forgiveness for his acts.	Volume 1, Page 48,	November 1613
Wrights	Some Members of Master Court	Some dodgy voting took place and the Deacon and Masters disputed the election. Ruling: The result was reversed and a new Deacon elected	Volume 1, Page 49, December 1613	December 1613
Wrights	Flesher	The Deacon of the Fleshers refused to pay certain fees and insulted the Deacon of the Wrights. Ruling: Deacon of Fleshers fined £10.	Volume 1, Page 70,	May 1616
Trades House	Hammermen	The Deacon of the Hammermen had wrongly made a freeman of his craft . Ruling: Deacon was fined.	Volume 1, Page 75,	November 1616
Weavers	Weavers	Members of the Weavers complained about John Clark, weaver for using sedition and trying to undermine the election so that he would become deacon. Ruling: John Clark was not allowed to be put forward for election and to suspend him for one year.	Volume 1, Page 76,	October 1616
Hammermen	Hammermen	Deacon complained that James Leishman miscalling him most shamefully and pressing him on his knees. Ruling: Lieshman was to be set down at the Cross on his knees and his own house and to crave God and the Deacon pardon for his offence.	Volume 1, Page 81,	August 1618
Weavers	Weavers	George Schirilaw complained that John Clark miscalled him mainsourne and that he also strived to be Deacon. Ruling: As both had called others names and were troublesome people to the Craft, they were to be taken off the leet to be Deacon and	Volume 1, Page 82	September 1618

		Masters of the Craft for a year.		
Tailor	Baker	James Briscatt (Tailor) and William Herriot (Baker), were both taken off the leets to be Deacon and Masters of their Crafts for one year.	Volume 1, Page 82	September 1618
Tailor	Tailor	Thomas Gray, Deacon of the Tailors complained about John Dalrimpill, (Tailor) for misusing and calling him. Ruling: John Dalrimpil was fined £10 to the weill of the poor, his booth window to be boarded up and a further fine of £10. As a further punishment he had to set down at the Market Cross on his knees and to crave God, the Deacon and the whole Craft pardon and he was not to have his freedom until he had done so.	Volume 1, Page 82	May 1619
Cooper	Cooper	The Coopers complained about James Scheillis concerning the election of the Deacon. John Smythe lied and falsified the evidence and when challenged he admitted it. Ruling: James Scheillis was fined £3 and John Smythe was fined as well, the money to go to the weill of the poor.	Volume 1, Page 86	November 1619
Deacon Convenor	Wrights	James Baird a Wright was accused by the Deacon Convenor of misbehaviour and disobedience towards the Deacon Convenor. Ruling: James Baird was fined £10 which was to be used to support the poor. He also had to crave of the Deacon Convenor for his wrong and homage or warding of his person	Volume 1, Page 105	July 1623
Weavers	Weavers	Ar[.....]d Paterson and a number of his colleagues in the Weavers complained about Johne Clark and his Masters of the Weavers for taking £50 out of the Box which was intended for the common good. Ruling: Johne Clark had to pay £10 and each of his named Masters had to pay a fine also. They also had to return the £50 or be put out of the Craft.	Volume 1, Page 107	December 1623

Weavers	Weavers	Patrik Clerk, the Deacon of the Weavers complained that John Clerk, his brother, John Finlay and John Kirlie, that when he was in the home of William Flemyngis with other honest men and "having no evil in his mind", John Kirlie came to him and asked what he had to do with Niell Steinstoun and having answered him truly, John Kirlie said that "he was nothing but a whore son and his sleeve". John Kirlie then ruffled his beard, punched him with his feat, abused his wife and bloodied his hand. Many more nasty comments were made by John Kirlie and the others. Ruling: John Kirlie was banned from holding the office of Deacon and was fined £20. The others were fined £3 and banned from voting in Craft elections for three years.	Volume 1, Page 115	March 1626
Weavers	Weavers	Patrik Clerk and James Wingzit were accused of misbehaving greatly in front of Johne Falconer their present Deacon by calling him names and James Wingzit threw a full cup of ale at Patrik Clerk. Ruling: Each were fined £4 for the use of the poor and they were warned that if they misbehaved again they would be banned from ever holding any office in the Craft.	Volume 1, Page 148	December 1630
Skinner	Hammermen	Manasses Lyll, Deacon of the Skinnners complained that Johne Liper, Hammerman, of doing the work of the Skinnners. Ruling: John Liper was instructed to stop doing the Skinnners work under pain of £10.	Volume 1, Page 177	February 1636
Cooper	Cooper	A complaint by a number of Coopers was made alledging that the poor were not receiving a fair amount from the Craft and that there was some dodgy business going on. Ruling: The craft were instructed in detail how to behave in a fair and proper manner.	Volume 1, Page 191	August 1638
Deacon Convenor	Barbers and Others	The Deacon Convenor noted that the Barbers were drinking and debouching on the way home from the kirk to the great offence of God. Ruling: If anyone in the burgh was caught drinking or profaning, they would be fined 20 shillings for each fault.	Volume 1, Page 192	August 1638

Deacon Convenor	Coopers	The Coopers spent money intended for the poor on drinking and other uses to the great offence of God hurt and prejudice of the poor. Ruling: The Deacon and members of the Coopers were instructed to spend their money on the poor and other good and pious uses and that their accounts be checked in future by the Deacon Convenor.	Volume 1, Page 224	March 1643
Deacon Convenor	Tailors	Patrik Adame was ordained to pay £5 to the poor which he had failed to do so on 29th May 1642 for his rude carriage before the Deacon Convenor and brethren of the Counsel. Ruling: Patrik Adame would never hold rank in his Craft until he pays the fine and made full satisfaction to the Deacon Convenor and all the Deacons and their brethren counsel for his wrong doings.	Volume 1, Page 226	August 1643
Deacon Convenor	All Crafts	church within the burgh as has happened previously. Ruling: Any Deacon contravening this ruling would have to pay £5 and that every Deacon bring his quarterly accounts to the hospital and to pay £5 to the Collector of the House for the use of the poor rather than making the Craft's Collectors pay as has happened before on pain of £5 fine.	Volume 1, Page 253	August 1647
Deacon Convenor	Coopers	Cuthbert Greg, the late Deacon of the Coopers had refused to render the box as he had been commanded several times on command of the Deacon Convenor and had refused to attend the House meeting as instructed. Ruling: The magistrates were " <i>acquainted to ward him until he is sensible and pays £10 fine to the poor</i> " and he was banned from holding office in his craft until he gives satisfaction to the House.	Volume 1, Page 278	November 1649
Weavers	Gorbals Weavers	The Deacon of the Weavers complained at the number of Gorbals Weavers and the likelihood that the Glasgow Weavers would be " <i>turned to beggars</i> ". Ruling: George Broune, James Elphistoun, John Hall and Robert Wilsoune were appointed to meet with the Deacon of the Weavers and bring a solution to the House.	Volume 1, Page 298	February 1652

Dyers	Dyers	Johne Lindsay, Litster (Dyer), complained that Gorg Findlay and Nicoll Edglie litsters had broken common equipment after Johne Lindsay had repaired them. Ruling: Gorg Finflay and Nicoll Edglie had to pay Johne Lindsay £7 he had paid out in making the repair and the culprits were instructed to repair the equipment as new at their own cost.	Volume 1, Page 322	August 1655
Wrights	Wrights	The Deacon presented a leet for the position of Masters and omitted to place James Elphistoune on it which resulted in most of the members walking out and refusing to vote. The Deacon reported that James Elphistoune had declared at his admission that he would have nothing to do with them and cast down his shilling starling as his years' payment, he had left the meeting and had not attended any other meeting. The Deacon also commented that he had not sworn his oath and therefore was not eligible to vote. The Deacon Convenor checked with the others on the leet and found that four had not or could not remember swearing their oath. Ruling: Only the two who had sworn should be put forward on the leet to become Deacons.	Volume 1, Page 322	September 1655
Weavers	Deacon Convenor	It was proven that Patrick Clark, the late Deacon of the Weavers had said that Manasses Lyle was not worthy to bear the office of Deacon Convenor. Ruling: Patrick Clark was fined £40 and to remain in ward until the sum was payed and he apologised to Manasses Lyle for his wrong doing. Patrick Clark was also banned from holding office in his craft in future.	Volume 1, Page 323	October 1655
Deacon Convenor	All Crafts	Deacon Convenor Manasses Lyle commented that some of the members of the crafts had misbehaved in front of the Deacon Convenor. Ruling: Any craftsmen who miscarry or misbehave in outrageous or vilifying speeches as has been used by some in the past to the Deacon Convenor or Deacon of his calling, in private or public shall after a suitable trial and found guilty, be banned from holding office in his craft or the House.	Volume 1, Page 323	October 1655
Maltmen	Trades House	The Maltmen purchased the two House mortcloths for the sum of £41 at an auction.	Volume 1, Page 327	November 1655

Deacon Convenor	Wrights	James Elphisoun, Glass Wright and John Daniell, Wright had done some wrong to the late Deacon Convenor Manasses Lyle. Ruling: They were banned from carrying out their trade until they gave satisfaction for their wrong to Manassesd Lyle.	Volume 1, Page 328	November 1655
Dyers	Dyers	Mathow Bourne and Nicoll Edglie, Listers (Dyers) were found guilty of the most shameful abusing and upbraiding of their present headsman and oversman Johne Lindsay with filthy and detestable words not worthy of repeating. Ruling: They were both fined 19 merks and they were to give full satisfaction to Johne Lindsay and they were also to be held in the Tolbooth until they gave satisfaction to their headsman.	Volume 1, Page 329	March 1625
Dyers	Dyers	Due to the misbehaviour of Mathow Bourne and Nicoll Edglie, Listers (Dyers) the Deacon Convenor met with all of the Dyers and made it clear that filthy and shameless abuse given to thir headsman and oversman was unacceptable. Ruling: The Litsers would in future behave in a Christian manner towards their headsman, they would pay £4 for the booking of each apprentice, £4 for each journeyman or servant not serving an apprenticeship in the burgh and none of them shall lit cloth (dye cloth) for James Smith in Duntocher, Alexander Findlay in Kirkintilloch, Robert Thomson in Paisly or to any person outwith the burgh who claim to by Litsers or any dealings with unfreemen under pain of £40 fine.	Volume 1, Page 330	March 1656
Hammermen	Tailors	Alexander Jafra the Deacon of the Hammermen complained that Gilbert Moresoune of the Tailors was manufacturing and importing saddles and this was part of the Hammermen craft. Gilbert Moresoune admitted his error and claimed he was a stranger, lately come to the burgh and unaware of this ruling. Ruling: The Tailors were instructed not to carry out any saddler work and if they did they would be fined £20 and that Gilbert Moresoune should pay £20 to the Hammermen.	Volume 1, Page 338	November 1656

Cordiners	Barkers and Tanners	Hew Andersoune and James Mitchell Cordiners and shoemakers, complained that the Barkers and Tanners (Cordiners) were supplying insufficient quantities of leather to the shoemakers. They asked that the most qualified shoemakers become masters in equal numbers to the barkers and tanners to enable fair votes to take place. Ruling: The six most qualified shoemakers should become Masters in the Cordiners and that in future they should be half shoemakers and half Barkers and Tanners.	Volume 1, Page 340	January 1657
Coopers	Coopers	Robert Marschell, Deacon of the Coopers complained that his officer Johne Gemill was disobedient and misbehaved himself to the Deacon. Ruling: Johne Gemill was fined 10 merks instead of the £5 as fined by his craft and if he misbehaves or disobeys again he will lose his liberty of his craft.	Volume 1, Page 343	May 1657
Skinners	Skinners	George Clerk the late Deacon of the Skinners complained that James Padie present Deacon of the Skinners and John Caldwell and others opened the Skinners Box, without the Deacon being present. Androw Love and William Govane also admitted being present and involved. Four bands had been taken away and are now missing. Ruling: The four: James Padie, John Caldwell, Androw Love and William Govane shall not hold office in the Skinners until the four bands are returned. They should also give satisfaction to the House and each pay a fine of 5 dollars for the poor.	Volume 1, Page 344	August 1657

Skinner	Skinner	George Clerk the late Deacon of the Skinner complained that James Padie, the present Deacon of the Skinner and William Govane, Skinner who had previously been defenders and had been censored by the Deacon Convenor for opening the Craft Box and that four bands were ow missing from the Box and that James Padie in the presence of others had falsely claimed that he had opened the Box and taken the bands and that William Govane had seen him do so. James Padie had said these things on numerous occasions in front of others and had damaged his good name. James Clerk produced two famous witnesses for his defence. Ruling: The House found the accused guilty and fined them 10 dollars and to remain in ward until the payment is made. The accused had also to give satisfaction to George Clerk and the House for the wrong that they had done.	Volume 1, Page 345	August 1657
Deacon Convenor	Poor Men of the Hospital	[] Naysmith and John Currie, two poor men in the hospital were accused of bad miscarriage. Ruling: Both were ordered to remove themselves from the hospital and not to be readmitted until the give better testimony to their good carriage.	Volume 1, Page 347	August 1657
Skinner	Skinner	As a follow up to James Padie's misbehaviour, he freely allowed his servant [] Reid to join another master to complete his years of apprenticeship.	Volume 1, Page 347	August 1657
Deacon Convenor	Wrights	The Deacon of the Wrights and members of the Wrights had sent Harie Ore to the Tolbooth in Stirling. No substantial evidence was given against Harie Ore. Ruling: The Deacon of the Wrights and the whole Craft were instructed to sned for Harie Ore and to return him the Glasgow as a freeman and to pay all expenses. The Wrights also had to reply positively within ten hours and carry out the above instructions or they would be disowned.	Volume 1, Page 352	May 1658

Hammermen	Hammermen	Alexander Jafra the late Deacon of the Hammermen and another Hammerman complained that John Burnes the present Deacon of the Hammermen and a number of others had publicly accused him of stealing five or six or seven pounds of silk which had been stolen from the manufacture of two mortcloths for use by the craft. They had been called common theives and their good names tarnished and James Johnstone and John Dunkiesoun had offered 40 shillings to prosecute him. The mortcloths were cut up and weighed but the weight matched what it should be so this was kept secret. Ruling: The House found in favour of the complainant and John Burnes and the others who had falsely accused Alexander Jafra were found incapable of holding office until they had given satisfaction to the House and aggrieved parties	Volume 1, Page 353	September 1658
Coopers	Coopers	Robert Marschell, the late Deacon of the Coopers complained that Cuthbert Grege, the present Deacon of the Coopers had prevented him from becoming a member of the Master Court when he should have been the first Master and holder of the special key to the craft Box. Ruling: Cuthbert Grege to make Robert Marschell one of the first Masters of the craft for the coming year and to give him the special key to the craft Box as is and has been the custom. In future no new Deacon shall put the old Deacon off the Master Court and he shall be given the special key to the craft Box.	Volume 1, Page 363	October 1660
Deacon Convenor	All Crafts	For some time it had been understood that Deacons should not hold office for more than one year as it had made much evil and wrong in the craft. Ruling: No person whatsoever to be Deacon for more than one year under pain of £100 scots.	Volume 1, Page 363	October 1660

Bakers	Bakers	John Buchanan, present Deacon of the Bakers had violated and broken the act of the Bakers preventing anyone bearing office of Deacon for more than one year and had himself elected as Deacon for a second year. Ruling: The Bakers were instructed to meet and choose a Master from last year as their Deacon for year to come.	Volume 1, Page 364	October 1660
Hammermen	Cordiners	A complaint was presented by the Hammermen against Hugh Andersone, cordiner stating that he had cut leather and made some belts and he should not have done so as beltmakers are appendices of the Hammermen. Hugh admitted his guilt. Ruling: In future Hugh and other members of the Cordiner craft should not make belts or infringe the liberties of the Hammermen and discharged Hugh.	Volume 1, Page 371	February 1661
Hammermen	Cordiners	Hugh Andersone admitted cutting a belt after he had been discharged by the Deacon Convenor for making belts. Ruling: Hugh was fined £10 and escorted to prison by Johne Pattersone the House Officer, where he would reside until the fine was paid.	Volume 1, Page 371	February 1661
Deacon Convenor	Hammermen	The Deacon of the Hammermen was instructed to convene his key Masters and to bring the Craft Box before the House so that it could be opened and the act against Alexander Jaffray be deleted and scored out.	Volume 1, Page 372	August 1661
Deacon Convenor	Coopers	Cuthbert Greg, the Deacon of the Coopers was ordered to pay Jonet Hill a widow of the craft, double of what she shall be found to want. Due to his former ignoring of House Acts he is to do this in the sight of the Deacon Convenor and the Visitor of the Maltmen, William Boyd.	Volume 1, Page 372	August 1661
Coopers	Coopers	Cuthbert Greg, Deacon of the Coopers was instructed to return 10 marks to William Pollok that they had taken from him for sending his apprentice abroad for the service of the country and to win his living and to help his master.	Volume 1, Page 372	August 1661

Hammermen	Hammermen	Patrick McIlvicker a Hammermen complained that Alexander Govane the present Deacon of the Hammermen was preventing him from employing a skilled craftsman from London to enable him to improve his Pewter making and had fined him £20. Pewterers were a pendicle of the Hammermen trade and he should be allowed to move from one Hammermen trade to another as was the practice. Ruling: It was ruled after a great deal of thought and discussion that Patrick should be allowed to follow the trade of Pewterer and recommended that the Deacon of the Hammermen should at least weekly, inspect the work and if it was of a poor standard, to remove it and to give it to the poor.	Volume 1, Page 378	May 1662
Skinners	Skinners	John Auldcorn and Robert Bogill, Skinners, complained that Mannas Lyle, George Clerk and William Govane, Skinners, were making bargains with the fleshers to buy their skins so that the remaining skinners nad the poor could not purchase skins. This was causing suffering and hurt and also broke a statute of the burgh. Ruling: The case was remitted to the Provost Bailies Council for their sentence.	Volume 1, Page 387	September 1663
Coopers	Coopers	A number of Coopers complained that the present Deacon had charged them too much to join the craft, especially as they were the sons of freemen and that there was not a consistent level of charges for membership. Ruling: the Deacon and the craft were tasked to set the fee for freemen sons at £16 and that this should become part of the Coopers statutes.	Volume 1, Page 401	May 1665
Wrights	Wrights	A number of Wrights " <i>for their own pernicious ends</i> ", had asked other Wrights to sign a paper which were seditious and would cause trouble amongst the members of the Wrights and that the comments were aimed at their Deacon Alexander Eglington. Ruling: Each of the named Wrights were fined 2 dollars for the use of the poor.	Volume 1, Page 401	May 1665

Deacon Convenor	Wrights	The Deacon and others had removed 300 marks to lend to Camstrodden which they should not have done. Ruling: Robert Reid in Drygait was given the key to the Wrights box until Michaelmas next which James Reid held and recommends that the Deacons of the Tailors, Weavers, Skinners and Masons, with the Box Masters of the Wrights, should visit the Wrights Box to ensure that no harm has been done to it by the Deacon.	Volume 1, Page 401	May 1665
Coopers	Coopers	The Deacon of the Coopers and other members of the Coopers complained that Johne Gemmil (Cooper). Ruling: The Deacon of the Coopers or some representing him should go to Dumbarton with Johne Gemmil and purchase the rest of the staves that are not sold and also 3500 girthies already purchased by Johne Gemmill to be equally divided between the members of the Coopers and if there were no girthies in Dumbarton, Johne Gemmil should divide his amongst the craft and they recompensing him.	Volume 1, Page 401	March 1665
Coopers	Coopers	Johne Gemmill submitted himself to the Craft and the House and would follow the rules of the Craft in future or be fined £40 for the use of the poor. Ruling: In future all Coopers will submit to the rules of the Craft and none should buy rungs abroad either in burghs or landwort except that the bargain will be for the whole Craft.	Volume 1, Page 402	April 1665
Coopers	Coopers	Ruling: All staves, girthes, steps and others of that kind imported at the Broomilaw should be purchased for the Craft and each member should have his share as long as they had paid for their previous shares.	Volume 1, Page 403	May 1665
Masons	Slaters	The Deacon of the Masons appealed to the House to ensure that any non-freemen in the burgh who carry outslating should become freemen or work for a freeman.	Volume 1, Page 403	May 1665

Coopers	Coopers	Cuthbert Greg the Deacon of the Coopers complained that a number of his Masters hindered him in enrolling Robert Gibsone as a journeyman with Johne Nisbet. Ruling: Robert Gibsone should be enrolled and that the five named Masters should be warded in the Tolbooth for disobeying their Deacon and Johne Pollock and James Ingraham (two of the above named) should be warded in close ward and that each of the five should be fined a new membership of the Coopers.	Volume 1, Page 414	November 1666
Cordiners	Cordiners	Three members of the Cordiners on behalf of the Cordiners and tanners, placed a complaint indicating that when they were in office, they and their predecessors were very active in collecting money for the poor decayed brethren and that when they were in power they had made a bargain with the Laird of Kinkaid to loan him 800 marks on top of 200 that he already owed and that this would be on a Band. Now Johne Wood the present Deacon is refusing to keep the agreement and intends to loan the money to Thomas Dobbie, brother-in-law to Johne Wood with some old property as collateral. The present Deacon, Johne Wood has also taken the Box key from the past Deacon James Mitchell and this has not been allowed for 40 years. Ruling: The money should be lent to the Laird of Kinkaid upon sufficient security and that the Box key be returned to Late Deacon James Mitchell.	Volume 1, Page 414	November 1666
Fleshers	Flesher	Andrew Watsounne (Flesher) complained that the Deacon of the Fleshers refused to admit him as a freeman of the Fleshers and Burgess and Guild Brethren and a freeman's son of a Flesher. Ruling: The Deacon with George Broom, Alexander Holmes and William Gilmour should produce their book because for the past three years they had refused to have their accounts audited. They flatly denied to do so. Ruling: They were all charged to remain in ward until they complied. The books were then produced and found to have missing entry money and other errors. They were instructed to admit Andrew Watsounne and to enter him and his money in the book and that they must show the	Volume 1, Page 420	May 1667

		book to the Deacon Convenor in future.		
Wrights	Wrights	Alexander Eglintoun, Deacon of the Wrights had fined George Drew, Wright, a new membership of 20 marks for abusing Alexander Daniell the late Deacon of the Wrights. Ruling: George Drew was instructed to pay 20 marks to cover the membership of William Reid son of David Reid and to give satisfaction to Alexander Daniel and also that George Drew should not have any votes in his Craft or hold any office or charge in the House for all time coming.	Volume 1, Page 420	May 1667
Fleshers	Flesher	Alexander Park was accused of calling Johne Barrie, Deacon of the Fleshers " <i>a knawe and a liar</i> ". Ruling: Alexander Park was fined £5 16s and the money to be given to James Jap for his supply. Alexander Park was also instructed to give satisfaction to the Deacon.	Volume 1, Page 461	February n1672
Wrights	Wrights	Alexander Daniziell the Deacon of the Wrights complained that Robert Dickie one of the Wrights had called him and other honest Wrights " <i>But pendicles</i> " with several other railings, vilifyings and threatening expressions. Robert Dickie also said " <i>most malicious utter the same</i> " and made it clear that he thought that the Deacon Convenor and the House had no authority in the matter. Robert Dickie had been fined and imprisoned three years previously for a similar offence. Ruling: Robert Dickie was fined 20 marks and not allowed to hold office, have a vote in elections and if he miscalls anyone on the Trade, he would be fined £5 for the use of the poor and 40 shillings to the Baillies.	Volume 1, Page 471	March 1673
Weavers	Weavers	Johne Patersonne the Deacon of the Weavers petitioned due to the great want of work among his brethren due to the large number of strangers who were becoming freemen with the Weavers due to the small freedom fine on joining. The Weavers had enacted that all new Far Hand members would pay £80 and asked that the House ratifies this decision. Ruling: The act was ratified.	Volume 1, Page 472	May 1673

Coopers	Coopers	The Deacon of the Coopers brought a complaint against William Shiells, Johne Scott and Johne Neisbit (Coopers) for breaking an act agreed to by Walter Neilson, Deacon Convener at a meeting of the House on 8th November 1665, whereby any rungs staves splits etc. purchased should be sold to the Burges of the Trade equally and that the above named had purchased rungs and refused to share them amongst the craft. Ruling: The three were instructed to sell to their brethren proportionally their share of the rungs. The Deacon Convenor ruled that in future if any Cooper purchased staves, rungs etc. more than 6 miles from the Burgh, they may keep them for themselves.	Volume 1, Page 481	April 1674
Wrights	Wrights	Alexander Danizell late Deacon of the Wrights in plce of the deceased Alexander Egleintoun Deacon, complained that Johne Coorse had several times abused him with unhansome expressions not fit to be repeated. Ruling: Johne Corse was fined £10 for his several faults and declared incapable of holding any office in the Trade for three years and that he should have no vote or voted in for that period.	Volume 1, Page 482	June 1674
Maltmen	Maltmen	The Visitor of the Maltmen complained that Peter Corbet and Robert Robiesone (Maltmen) said that they would not enrol their apprentices with the Maltmem. They also used unsavoury comments about the Maltmen and their Craft. Ruling: They were fined 20 merks which had to be payed to the Collector and 40 shillings scots to be paid to the Baillies and that they should be imprisoned until they pay their fines. They were also to give satisfaction to the Deacon Convenor, Deacons, Visitor of the Maltmen and Masters of the Maltmen and that neither should be able to vote or be voted in until he pays the 4000 marks.	Volume 1, Page 510	April 1677

Letter of Guildry	All Crafts	All burgesses' wives within the burgh shall have for the present enjoy such privileges and liberties during the time of their widowhood as if their husbands were alive in the benefits of the guildry paying to the Dean of Guild 13 shillings and 4 pennies and 3 shillings 4 pennies to the hospital of his choosing. The said widows being tried by the Dean of Guild and his council to be of good and honest conversation and the widows to come shall have the same liberty if their husbands have been guild brethren otherwise not to enjoy that profit and benefit.	Volume 1, Page 541	9 February 1695
Tailors	Tailors	Cornelius Luke the Deacon of the Tailors complained that many people had been guilty of questioning lawful authority, raising strife and sedition among the craft and should be severely punished. David Biskett was named as one of the people who had participated in one or more of the crimes. David Biskett had railed against him and say the " <i>he was a Deacon illegally chosen and no Deacon and that he had chosen as great a Jacobite in Glasgow to be one of his Masters and that he was a great Jacobite himself.</i> " David Biskett was accused of saying such things and worse at various public meetings. Ruling: The House found the accusation proven and ruled that David Biskett should hold no office in the Tailor Craft for five years and would convene at another meeting of the House to rule on any further punishment.	Volume 2, Page 35	May 1716
Tailor	Trades House	David Biskett appealed against being not allowed to vote in elections or bear any office for the next five years. Ruling: David Biskett's appeal was upheld.	Volume 2, Page 38	February 1777
Barbers	Barbers	John Tassie petitioned the House to make the Barbers accept him as a freeman as he had served his time with William Ewing (Barber) for three years and a further two years with John McAuley (Barber), in the art of trimming, shaving etc. Ruling: The House found that John Tassie had served a total of five years and saw no reason why he should not become a freeman and the Barbers were instructed to allow him to join their craft.	Volume 2, Page 68	July 1772

Barbers	Barbers and Surgeons	Alexander Milne Deacon of the Barbers presented a petition to the House indicating that in 1656 the freemen surgeons and barbers became one incorporation. On 19th December 1719 all the surgeon signed a writ which in effect meant that they renounced and surrendered their privileges and the Town Council have agreed that as far as they are concerned, the letter of Deaconry was void and extinct as far as the surgeons were concerned. On 22nd September 1722 the Barbers received their new letter of Deaconry. On 28th September 1722 the Barbers met and elected Alexander Milne as their Deacon. The Barbers therefore petitioned the House to admit the Deacon and two other representatives as representatives on the House. Ruling: The House unanimously agreed.	Volume 2, Page 76	October 1722
Masons	Masons	Late Deacon William Kerr besieged the House to allow Hugh Kerr the lawful son of George Kerr of Bogeyside in Auchans of Dundonald to be booked by the Craft as a Mason Apprentice from 1721. The Deacon of the Masons at the time of Hugh Kerr's indenture had refused to book him as an apprentice. Ruling: Having heard the evidence it was ruled that the indentures were collusive and artfully contrived and that the Mason Craft were right in not booking Hugh Kerr.	Volume 2, Page 80	April 1723
Masons	Barbers	There was a dispute raised as to the seniority of the Masons and the Barbers.	Volume 2, Page 88	October 1723
Masons	Barbers	The House met to consider the claim that the barbers should be ranked higher than the Masons. Ruling: the House ruled that prior to the split with the Surgeons, the Barbers were placed between the Bonnetmakers and the Gardeners and that the Barbers should in all time coming be so ranked. Alexander Milne, the Deacon of the Barbers informed the House that he intended to appeal to the Town Council.	Volume 2, Page 89	January 1724

Tailors	Tailors	John Minto and Cornelius Luke presented a petition to the House concerning the ruling that no person was allowed to vote for the position of Deacon if they owed money to the trade. At the Tailors election not one person who voted for John Minto owed even a farthing whilst eleven members who voted for Gabriel Corsbie owed money to the trade. The results of the election were 74 votes to Gabriel Corsbie and 71 to John Minto. Therefore John Minto should have been declared Deacon. Ruling: It was declared that John Minto be Deacon of the Tailors.	Volume 2, Page 97	September 1724
Tailors	Tailors	A petition was presented to the House by John Minto, Cornelius Luke and James Steven saying that when they met to elect a Deacon, John Minto as the present Deacon was not allowed to have his normal vote as Deacon and casting vote in case of a tie. Gabriell Corsbie has 89 votes and Cornelius Luke had 88 and that the Deacon would have given him his vote and casting vote also. Ruling: The House ruled that John Minto should have his normal vote and casting vote and therefore Cornelius Luke was the elected Deacon.	Volume 2, Page 100	September 1725
Weavers	Weavers	A complaint and petition was made by James Mitchell weaver indicating that he had taken on an indentured apprentice Thomas Burnside the lawful son of Robert Burnside an indweller in Glasgow and dated 9th April 1725. One of the items in the indenture stated that if Thomas was absent then his father would pay 6/8d for each day of his absence. During his time with James Mitchell, the apprentice absented himself for 40 days and even when he was present his work was often below standard and that he (James Mitchell) had given him a slap or two with is loof on his shoulders. The apprentice then applied to Robert Wood the Deacon of the Weavers, saying that he had been beaten by his master and wished to be released from his service and to be an apprentice to another. The Deacon and Masters agreed to this and ruled that the present Master could not take	Volume 2, Page 125	January 1727

		on another apprentice. All this was done without proof. Ruling: The House ruled that as there was no proof then the previous arrangements should stand.		
Barbers	Barbers	Charles Andersonne and John Robertsons barbers complained that George Buchanan, the Deacon at the time had in a violent manner refused to allow the clerk to read out the names of those who owed money to the craft or were receiving charity from it. 22 who did not owe money voted for Charles Andersonne and 22 voted for Alexander Leggatt, 4 of which owed money to the craft. The Deacon owed 4/- to the trade and he also cast the casting vote. Ruling: The House ruled that the procedures followed were flawed and that the Barbers were to reconvene and hold another election on 10th October and that George Buchanan, the last Deacon should preside and act as Deacon.	Volume 2, Page 129	September 1727
Barbers	Barbers	Alexander Leggat and George Buchanan barbers in Glasgow gave in a petition claiming that there were more members who voted for Charles Andersonne who were debtors than had voted for Alexander Leggatt and that he should have been made Deacon due to the majority of votes. Ruling: The House ruled that Alexander Leggat should be made Deacon and take the oath <i>de fidei administratione officii</i> .	Volume 2, Page 134	May 1728
Barbers	Barbers	John Buchanan late apprentice to John McAuley had received his indentures discharge and had applied to the Deacon of the Barbers to be admitted as a freeman even after he produced his indentures and Burgess ticket. Ruling: The House instructed the Deacon of the Barbers to convene his Masters and admit John Buchanan to an essay.	Volume 2, Page 161	March 1731

Barbers	Barbers	John Luke barber gave in a petition indicating that they had objected to the election of Robert Wallace as Deacon as he was not qualified to be made Deacon as his burgess ticket was <i>free gratis</i> . 23 had voted for Robert Wallace and 20 voted for William Keighny who was <i>burgess and Guild brother</i> . Ruling: The House ruled that as Robert Wallace had been a Master for a year and was now a burgess, he should be accepted as the Deacon of the Barbers and sworn in accordingly.	Volume 2, Page 167	September 1731
Barbers	Trades House	John Robertson the last Deacon of the Barbers has now quit his house and is living in the country, craved to be released from his duties to the House. Ruling: The House so released him.	Volume 2, Page 170	October 1731
Gardeners	Gardeners	Robert Moodie the Deacon of the Gardeners gave in a petition mentioning that at a meeting to elect a collector of the Gardeners, two names had been proposed and then some members put forward the name of Arthur Hamilton, who objected that he was not eligible as he was not a Guild Brethren and could neither read nor write. The members then elected Arthur Hamilton. The Deacon asked the House to remedy the situation to enable the craft to have a Collector. Ruling: The House declared the election null and void and instructed the Deacon along with his Masters to make up a new leat with 2 or 3 people who were burgesses and Guild Brothers and could write.	Volume 2, Page 170	November 1731
Weavers	Weavers	John Watsonne younger weaver complained that some weavers were taking stranger journeymen weavers from the country without making his serve 2 years for has his profit as is the rule in the Weaver Craft. Ruling: The House ruled it reasonable that any freeman weaver should be able to employ a journeyman that he thinks fit without distinction of where he comes from and for whatever wages they can agree on. This to be the practice of the Weavers in future and former acts to the contrary should be rescinded.	Volume 2, Page 172	March 1732

Coopers	Coopers	Ninian Urie cooper complained that there was an act in the Coopers which meant that journeymen had to make an essay (trade test piece) before they were allowed to serve the House. Ruling: The House found it unreasonable for journeymen to have to make an essay and ordained that they be allowed to serve without an essay and any Coopers Acts to the contrary should be rescinded.	Volume 2, Page 172	March 1732
Skinners	Skinners	The Deacon and several members of the Skinners complained that Walter and John Jamiesons for their refusal to obey an act of the Skinners regarding the cableing sheep and lamb skins. Ruling: The House appointed a sub-committee to look into the matter.	Volume 2, Page 174	May 1732
Barbers	Barbers	A complaint was made by Andrew Younger concerning the illegal election of John Weir as Deacon of the Barbers as he was a debtor. Ruling: the House found that John Weir was not a debtor at the time of his election and therefore his election was legal and that he should be sworn in as Deacon.	Volume 2, Page 182	November 1732
Barbers	Barbers	Robert Wallace Deacon of the Barbers complained that he had chosen Alexander Miln and John Cruickshanks as two of his masters, the trade refused to accept them. Ruling: The House instructed the Deacon to meet and warn the trade to accept the chosen Masters and if they do not he should name others in their stead.	Volume 2, Page 183	November 1732
Barbers	Barbers	Ruling: The House ruled that as John Weir was elected as a Master of the Barbers, ordained that he be received as a Master of that trade.	Volume 2, Page 183	November 1732

Barbers	Barbers	John Luke, barber complained that the Deacon and Masters had refused to book an apprentice unless he had payed £8 scots (the five years of his former apprentice's apprenticeship not being run) even though his new apprenticeship was only started 28 days before the end of the 5th year of his former apprentices' apprenticeship. Ruling: As John Luke had taken an apprentice before the end of his previous apprentices' indenture, that he ought to pay the £8 scots for the use of the poor before he can get the new apprentice booked.	Volume 2, Page 187	June 1733
Tailors	Tailors	None of the Tailor trade were listed in the minutes of the Trades House in October 1733 as they had not elected a Deacon for that year. Ruling: as John Millar was the last Deacon of the Tailors, tradition has it that he will serve on the House and therefore he will be leated as a Lyner for that year.	Volume 2, Page 194	October 1733
Tailors	Tailors	John Millar the last Deacon of the Tailors petitioned the House concerning the election of a new Deacon of the Tailors. Ruling: The House ruled that there should be a new election and John Millar should convene this meeting prior to 15th November and pay their debts to the trade. A meeting of the whole craft eligible to vote should be called for the 23rd November at 3pm in the Trades Hospital and vote for a new Deacon. A list of freemen that are eligible to vote should be in the Convenors' hands on the 15th November.	Volume 2, Page 194	November 1733
Trades House	All Crafts	Due to the number of disputes over the election of Deacons and Masters, the House made the following ruling. Ruling: Every Deacon and Visitor should hold his Lammas Court sometime in August, warn all freemen and they have to pay their quarterly dues at the meeting or have no vote in any affair of the trade or be eligible for election to any office in the trade. All elections of Masters, Collectors, clerks and officers must be before the 1st day of November.	Volume 2, Page 198	May 1734

Cordiners	Cordiners	Archibald Scott the Deacon of the Cordiners complained about the encroachment of outentown Cordiners and unfreemen in the burgh. Ruling: The House appointed Archibald Scott, Deacon of the Cordiners to go to Edinburgh with others to assist him to advise lawyers and to do whatever else they could to stoop the encroachment.	Volume 2, Page 207	June 1735
Gorbals Weavers	Weavers	John Goudie the Deacon of the Weavers in Glasgow presented a petition concerning the contract between the Gorbals Weavers and themselves where the Gorbals Weavers have to pay them 20/- scots for each loom in Gorbals. The Gorbals Weavers have applied to have the annual payments reduced to 16/- scots. The House was asked to assist in the matter. Ruling: The House appointed a sub-committee to discuss with the Weavers and apply to the magistrates for advice.	Volume 2, Page 215	November 1735
Cordiners	Cordiners	James Hunter the Deacon of the Cordiners claiming that the benefits and privileges of many of the Incorporations were being encroached by unfreemen and that James Bannatyne , a freeman Cordiners seized a pair of shoes brought into the city for sale by William McAuley in Caltun an unfreeman. This has always been the right of any freeman finding the sale of goods outside mercat days. The Procurator Fiscal William Weir had indicted him for robbery and that the privileges of all the Incorporations were under threat and hoped that the House would join with the Cordiners in defending James Bannatyne. Ruling: The House appointed a sub-committee to meet with the magistrates with a view to protect the trade privileges.	Volume 2, Page 216	August 1736
Cordiners	Cordiners	Ruling: The House ruled that the Cordiners were correct to defend James Bannatyne and that the House would pay a share in the cost of defending him.		

Skinner	Skinner	John Jamieson Deacon of the Skinners complained that 2 apprentices, John and James Barclays, that had entered the craft as freemen <i>gratis</i> , had not served a year as Officer to the craft as had been the custom for over 40 years. Neither had they paid any gratuity in lieu of service and were therefore debtors to the craft. At the election of the Deacon both had voted for Thomas Peadie. 14 honest freemen had voted for John Wilson and 15 for Thomas Peadie. An appeal was therefore made to the House that John and James Barclays' votes should not count towards Thomas Peadie and that John Wilson should be Deacon. Ruling: As no proof of debt by John and James Barclays had been produced, the election of Thomas Peadie as Deacon stood.	Volume 2, Page 250	October 1738
Bakerr	Baker	The Bakers put forward a petition complaining about Zacharias Allason being made a Masters of the trade. Ruling: the House ruled that Zacharias Allason should not be made a Master of the Bakers.	Volume 2, Page 265	May 1740
Wrights in Gorbals	Wright	A petition was presented by John Muirhead, oversman of the Wrights in the Gorbals asking that he and others might be made freemen in the Incorporation of Wrights in Glasgow. Ruling: the House decided that it was not able to rule on the matter and it was for the Wrightsd in Glasgow to decide.	Volume 2, Page 265	May 1740
Trades House	All Crafts	The House ordained that in future at House meetings the Deacons should direct their remarks to the Deacon Convenor only and no one should speak to another or interrupt another when they were speaking to the Deacon Convenor.	Volume 2, Page 294	November 1742
Bonnetmakers	Bonnetmakers	Ruling: Having heard several complaints about the election of Alexander Winzeat as Deacon of the Bonnetmakers. In the meantime the House appointed John Wylie, the last Deacon to officiate as Deacon while the House fully considered and determined the election.	Volume 2, Page 302	October 1743

Tailors	Tailors	James Buchanan elder had been elected Collector and refused to accept the position. Ruling: As James Buchanan was acting as Treasurer to the Town Council, he should be free from taking office. The Deacon was instructed to reconvene and elect a new Collector. It was also ruled that anyone who had been made Treasurer of the Town Council or Collector of the House would not have to accept election to Collector of any trade and all others would be obliged to pay a fine of £6 sterling for the use of the poor of the trade.	Volume 2, Page 305	November 1743
Bakers	Bakers	A complaint was made to the House by Thomas Mitchell, baker against the Deacon, Collector and Masters of the Bakers for allowing the Collector John Charity to not pay a debt of 5/- which was a fee paid by booking Zacharias Allason's apprentice and which had not been banked. Ruling: The House appointed a subcommittee to investigate and report back.	Volume 2, Page 306	December 1743
Bakers	Bakers	The sub-committee reported back on the complaint made to the House by Thomas Mitchell, baker against the Deacon, Collector and Masters of the Bakers for allowing the Collector John Charity to not pay a debt of 5/- which was a fee paid by booking Zacharias Allason's apprentice and which had not been banked. Ruling: The House found the judges that the Deacon and Masters had not applied to the House and had shown indignity to it. They also insisted that the new Collector should receive from the old Collector of the Bakers, John Charity, 5/- and cautioned the present Deacon of the Bakers, from doing this type of action again.	Volume 2, Page 309	April 1774
Maltmen	Maltmen	John Hamilton, the Visitor of the Maltmen asked that the ruling that quarter accounts had to be paid before Lambas court each year should be dispensed with as it was inconvenient to the Maltmen. Ruling: The House accepted the Maltmens case and ruled that they could pay their debts by 1st December and be allowed to vote and be leated in elections etc.	Volume 2, Page 309	June 1744

Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Bonnetmakers and Dyers	John James and David Wylie, bonnetmakers in Glasgow presented a petition asking the House to ratify a statute that they had enacted after they had received a goodly number of freemen into the incorporation on 8th November 1742, where they agreed that the Deacon would be a practicing bonnetmaker one year and any of the craft the next and so on... As the Incorporation had not had this statute ratified by the House, they asked for ratification and guidance. Ruling: The House ratified the statute of the Bonnetmakers and Dyers and laid down 12 rules which they had to follow.	Volume 2, Page 310	July 1744
Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Robert Marshall Deacon of the Dyers and Bonnetmakers petitioned that as they had little or no common stock or fund for the poor, had appointed a committee to find ways of augmenting their funds. They had since enacted a statute that every freeman who used indigo in the dying trade should pay 2 pennies scots for each pound of indigo used; every freeman who does not practice the dying trade should pay 2/- sterling yearly. Ruling: The House unanimously ratified the statute and authorised the Deacon and Collector and their successors to levy the members.	Volume 2, Page 318	June 1745

Barbers	Barbers	Robert Paull, Deacon and John Craig, Collector of the Barbers, presented a petition which they asked to ratify the enclosed acts of the Barbers dated 14th September 1746 which was a) Before any freeman enters as a journeyman to work, he should inform the Deacon and within 3 months and pay his booking money. If a Master fails to intimate to the Deacon or pay his journeyman's booking fee he shall be fined 20/- scots for the use of the poor. b) All Barbers who wish to sell their wigs out of town or further must take their wigs for inspection to the visitor inspector and stampmaster of wigs nominate in order that they can be inspected for quality and if appropriate they would be stamped with the trade stamp. c) The visitor and stampmaster to levy each wig of 2 pence sterling for their own use. Any member making and selling wigs without being stamped would be fined 5/- sterling per wig for the use of the poor. Ruling: The House ratified and approved the acts.	Volume 2, Page 331	September 1746
Bakers	Bakers	The House considered that Andrew Scott, Deacon of the Bakers was living mainly in the country and not attending House or many Craft meetings. Ruling: The House ruled that Andrew Scott could not be voted in as Deacon in the coming year or any future years whilst he resided in the country. He also lost the benefits of being a member of the House. No person in any trade can hold office in a trade if they reside mainly in the country.	Volume 2, Page 332	September 1746

Maltmen	Gardeners	Visitor of the Maltmen Andrew Thomson and Robert Stevenson, Collector of the Maltmen presented a petition that Robert Tennant, a Gardiner had made or paid others to make beer without him being a member of the Maltmen. The Maltmen had fined Robert Tennant 20 merks and banned him from malting until he had entered and paid the dues to become a Maltman. On being fined, Robert Tennant had approached the Court of Session and had a hold put on their act banning him from Malting. The Maltmen asked the House to guide them and to offer what support that they could. Ruling: The House offered all reasonable assistance in money or otherwise and encouraged them to fight the case to the end.	Volume 2, Page 335	September 1746
Bakers	Bakers	William Thomson and 5 other bakers complained that William Gilmour, John Auchincloss and James Yuill and their followers, some of whom were not qualified, had chosen and elected some unqualified managers to the trade. They asked that the wrongdoers should be punished. William Gilmour had as Deacon at the time had allowed Andrew Scott to be voted on to become Deacon whilst an act of the House made it clear that he should not whilst he resided in the country. Ruling: the House appointed late Deacon James Morrison to convene the craft and to elect a new Deacon out of the previous year's Masters.	Volume 2, Page 338	October 1746
Bakers	Bakers	William Thomson and other bakers brought to the attention of the House that they had asked the that William Gilmour, John Auchincloss and James Yuill should be punished and should not be allowed to be leated or have a vote or be voted on any election. Ruling: As John Auchincloss was baptised on 7th January 1728 and was therefore 18 years old and under age. The House ruled that William Gilmour was not to have any vote or in any election or be voted on or be a member of the House for 7 years. John Achincloss and James Yuill cannot be voted on or bear office for one year and that John Auchincloss nor any freeman of any Incorporation, can during their minority, bear the	Volume 2, Page 338	October 1746

		office of Deacon, Master or Collector or be a member of the House.		
Tailors	Tailors	John McKinlay, tailor protested to the House that he had been debarred from voting in an election of the Tailors on the pretext that he owed them 20 merks scots because he had taken two apprentices within five years, even though he did not. John Bore had been an apprentice bound to him but his indentures were cancelled and destroyed and he was later on a Journeyman. He had Robert Inglis as his only apprentice. He asked that the House find that he was not a debtor and that he should have the full privileges and rights of the trade. Ruling: The House found that John McKinlay did not have two apprentices within five years and was therefore not a debtor and should be restored to the rights and privileges of his trade.	Volume 2, Page 352	September 1748

Hammermen	Hammermen	<p>James Whytlaw, Deacon and William Downie, Collector complained that it has been tradition for longer than anyone can remember that Journeymen and apprentices would work from 6 in the morning until eight at night. A number of journeymen had got together and would only work from six in the morning to seven at night. The Deacon asked the House to ratify their traditional timings. James Colhoun and 30 journeymen petitioned that the work that they did was hard and they only had time to eat their meat when other trades had an hour for breakfast and dinner and stop work at six-o-clock. They did not have time to go to school and if they were allowed to stop at seven they could go to school and their work would be better during the day as they would be cheerier. The Deacon of the Hammermen reported that the apprentices and journeymen in Edinburgh worked from five in the morning to eight at night and that reducing the hours would inevitably raise the price of their goods and they were worried that their servants, instead of using their time for learning, might waste their time gossiping and drinking and making themselves unfit for work the next day. A number of journeymen had formed themselves into a society and elected a Deacon and Masters and making rules and regulations including stopping work at seven-o-clock in the evening. The Deacon of the Hammermen proposed a number of rules to prevent the above occurring and if a Master allowed their servants to stop work at seven in the evening they should be barred from voting or holding office for seven years and be fined £18 scot for the use of the poor. Ruling: The House ratified the act of the Hammermen.</p>	Volume 2, Page 354	November 1748
-----------	-----------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---------------

Coopers	Coopers	Deacon Duncan Campbell petitioned that late Deacon Peter Leckie for admitting Robert Hood, Hammerman; Andrew Younger and William Kirkland, barbers as members of the Cooper trade on the date of the Deacon's election and allowing them to vote in that election. 20 of the trade voted for Robert Auchincloss and 18 voted for Robert Robertson to be Deacon. Ruling: The House ruled that the three new members had a right to vote and that Robert Auchincloss was duly elected Deacon and should take the oath <i>de fidei administratione</i> .	Volume 2, Page 365	September 1749.
Maltmen	Gardeners	James Miller, Visitor and Patrick Reid senior, Collector presented a petition relating to a petition of the Maltmen in 1745 regarding Robert Tennant, Gardener had been stopped from brewing beer and ale for his personal use. The magistrates fined him 20 merks for use of the poor and discharged him from brewing until he became a member of the Maltmen. Robert Tennant then had his suspension lifted by the Lords of Council and Session as he did not make malt for sale and therefore was not obliged to enter the Maltmen Incorporation. Ruling: the House supported the Maltmen in their defence of their rights	Volume 2, Page 368	December 1749
Maltmen	Gardeners	The Visitor of the Maltmen met with the House and there was a vote on whether the House would support the Maltmen in appealing to the Lords of Council in the case between them and Robert Tennant, Gardener. Ruling: 90 voted for non-submission and 2 voted that the case should be submitted to the Court of Session.	Volume 2, Page 370	February 1750

Barbers	Barbers	A petition was presented by the Deacon and Collector of the Barbers indicating that the Barber journeymen, servants and apprentices had been used to working from six in the morning to nine at night without complaint until several journeymen had joined together and would not work later than from six in the morning to eight at night. If this was allowed to happen the Barbers would have to raise the cost of their work and that the their servants would waste the extra time on drinking etc and not be fit to work the next day. The Barbers proposed that any Master who did not ensure that their servants worked from six in the morning to nine at night would be banned from voting or holding office for seven years and be fined £10 scots. Ruling: The House ratified the Barbers statute with the exception that Masters could allow their servants to stop at eight-o-clock at night if they were advancing their knowledge by going to school in the evening.	Volume 2, Page 375	October 1750
Barbers	Barbers	Duncan Niven and other Barbers complained about Andrew Duncan, Deacon of the Barbers who had prevented James Selkirk, a member of the Barbers and past officer being put on a leet to be officer. Walter King, the Barbers poor man in the Hospital, had been elected instead. Duncan Niven requested that the Deacon should be censured for his actions. Ruling: A petition was presented indicating that James Selkirk had several malpractices and misdemeanours against him and an act of the Barbers against him finding him to be unworthy to be the officer. The House ratified Andrew Younger's actions and found James Selkirk incapable of being officer for seven years.	Volume 2, Page 377	October 1750

Merchant	Wrights	Robert Ewing, merchant asked the House to instruct the Wrights to allow him to become a member as he was married to Isobell Barton, the daughter of Walter Barton, a freeman of the Wrights. He had applied several times to the Wrights but had always been refused. Ruling: The House ordained that at the next meeting of the Wrights, they should admit Robert Ewing without an essay upon paying his dues and renouncing all freedom privileges to any children of his body except the children between him and Isobell Barton.	Volume 2, Page 381	September 1751
Coopers	Fleshers	George McRae, Deacon of the Coopers gave in a petition stating that the Coopers, in times past, were ranked before the Fleshers and that for some reason this has been altered for the past number of years. He requested that the Coopers be returned to their precedence in the House. Ruling: The House accepted the Coopers case and the ranking in the Trades House was listed as: Hammermen; Tailors; Cordiners; Maltmen; Weavers; Bakers; Skinners; Wrights; Coopers; Fleshers; Masons; Gardeners; Barbers; Bonnetmakers and Dyers.	Volume 2, Page 385	April 1752
Weavers	Trades House	Patrick McCumming, Deacon of the Weavers asked the House for support in reversing an act of Parliament which would allow anyone to set themselves up as weavers without being a member of the Incorporation. Ruling: The House agreed to ask the Glasgow members of Parliament to oppose the bill.	Volume 2, Page 395	December 1753
Skinners	Weaver in Gorbals	Late Deacon John Jamieson of the Skinners complained that the present Deacon John Wilson had improperly accepted John Henderson, weaver in Gorbals as a member of the Skinners on the grounds that he was the son of William Jack a freeman of the Skinners, by marrying Margaret Jack, daughter of William Jack. Margaret Jack was dead before he applied to become a member of the Skinners. The House had on the 18th January approved the enrolment of John Henderson but had declared that the appeal should come before the House. Ruling: The House heard the appeal and ruled that John Henderson should not be	Volume 2, Page 398	March 1754

		booked as a freeman of the Skinners and his admission money should be returned to him.		
Hammermen	Hammermen	James Glen, Deacon of the Hammermen presented a petition indicating that three saddlers entered into a partnership with 4 merchants to carry on a trade of making and selling saddles and other horse furniture though the merchants were not Hammermen. The Hammermen took the seven to the magistrates who ruled that the magistrates ruled in their favour but the defendants produced a letter of advocation. The Hammermen asked the House for their advice and support. Ruling: The House approved of the Hammermen's conduct and authorised them to proceed with the utmost vigour.	Volume 2, Page 399	June 1754
Skinners	Skinners	Hugh Bryson and Alexander Paterson, Master Skinners, complained that an act of 18th May 1711 that prevented the purchase of more than 100 green sheep skins or more than 100 green lamb skins at once under the penalty of £5 scots for each transgression and that if a Skinner buys from a Fleshers more than 12 green sheep or lamb skins, any freeman could apply to purchase share of the skins on paying ready money and failure to share would result in a fine of £5 scots. It was stated that the present Deacon John Jamieson, Rob Shearer the Collector and 7 other members of the Skinners and at least one, Jean Park had for at least six years been buying green skins above the number specified and making a monopoly of the skins and not selling shares to other freemen. John Jamieson replied stating that the act was contrary to the law and liberty of the subject and hurtful to him and several others as restraining them from the full and free exercise of their business. Ruling: The House upheld the act of the Skinners as it appeared that the act was for the benefit and utility of all its members.	Volume 2, Page 408	January 1755

Fleshers	Fleshers	Matthew Lawson, younger a freeman Flesher petitioned that at the last election of their Collector, Archibald Alexander was put forward as Collector and was successful even though many had objected on the grounds that he was a minor and gave proof of such. Matthew Lawson asked the House to uphold its previous ruling of 13th October 1746. Ruling: The House declared the election of Archibald Alexander null and void and instructed the Deacon to hold a new election	Volume 2, Page 410	February 1755
Gardeners	Gardeners	The Deacon and Masters of the Gardeners gave in a petition outlining that James Ferguson, Gardener burgess had an indenture which indicated that he had served his apprenticeship with William Haltridge, Gardener. James Ferguson had in fact only served a few weeks with William Haltridge and had served the remainder of his time with William Bryce another freeman of the Incorporation, and they had resided outwith the Royalty, the Gardeners now felt that James Ferguson could not become a freeman of the Gardeners and sought the advice of the House. If the House felt that he should be made a freeman then the gardeners who live outwith the royalty and sell their wares in the common market, should be able to become freemen gardeners. Ruling: The House ruled that James Ferguson should be made a member of the Gardeners and that as so much ground previously used for cultivation was now being used for other purposes, Gardeners who lived within one mile of the Regality and who sold their roots and herbs there should be allowed to become members of the Incorporation on paying his dues. These privileges should now be extended to any freeman of any of the other Incorporated Trades.	Volume 2, Page 411	February 1755

Hammermen and Cordiners	Merchants and Saddlers	James Lindsay Deacon of the Hammermen and John Forsyth Deacon of the Cordiners petitioned the House concerning several actions pursued before the Lords of Council and Session by the Hammermen and Cordiners against James Dunlop junior and others merchants and three saddlers for making and selling saddlery, boots and shoes without being freemen Hammermen or Cordiners. The Lords of Council and Session found in favour of the interlocutors and the Hammermen and Cordiners sought the Houses' agreement and support in appealing to the House of Lords. Ruling: The House agreed to pay 1/3 of the costs with the Hammermen paying 1/3 and the Cordiners 1/3. The Deacon Convener and Baillie Robert Finlay agreed to go to London and plead their case.	Volume 2, Page 423	February 1757
Hammermen and Cordiners	Merchants and Saddlers	A letter was sent to the House from William Bogle, James Douglass junior, Thomas Peter, James Dunlop and Robert Marshall all partners in the new saddle and shoe factory in Glasgow indicating that each partner would pay the freedom fines of the respective trades and their servants would become liable for the same dues and regulations. As the partners were not practical men in the business they asked that they be allowed not to sit an essay as their foremen would do so and be in charge of the workmanship of the factory. The Deacons suggested that the foremen would sit the essay and be entered as a freeman of the respective trade. The Deacons of the Hammermen and the Cordiners had convened meetings of their trades and they had agreed to this. Ruling: The House, by a majority ratified and approved the Deacons' decision.	Volume 2, Page 424	March 1757

Hammermen and Cordiners	Merchants and Saddlers	The Deacon Convener reported that he had received a letter from James Dunlop indicating that the partners were willing to become members of the Incorporations and pay their dues etc., but he was not willing to agree to his foremen having to become members. They would sit the essay, but not become members. Ruling: The House recommended to the Hammermen and Cordiners to accept the partners as freemen and not oblige the foremen to be entered as freemen.	Volume 2, Page 425	March 1757
Barbers	Trades House	John Cars, Deacon of the Barbers submitted a petition requesting that Alexander Edwards, Andrew Haltridge, William McLean, William Cassills, Robert Stevenson and John Craig have their sentence of 19th November 1754 set aside and be allowed to vote and be voted on in elections of the craft. Ruling: The House agreed to the petition and they would be allowed to vote and be voted on as long as they were not debtors to the craft.	Volume 2, Page 429	September 1757
Baker	Baker	Baillie Thomas Scott, baker and seven others complained that the election of the Masters had been carried out improperly and was therefore null and void. Ruling: The House investigated the complaint and found it to be true and therefore the election was null and void. The Deacon Convener instructed Deacon John Auchinclos to reconvene the trade and to elect the Masters in accordance with previous practice.	Volume 2, Page 439	October 1758

Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Alexander Ralph the Deacon of the Bonnetmakers and Dyers presented a petition which requested that the House support them in becoming a recognised Incorporation. The reason that this was necessary was that " <i>there had been great abuses in the colouring, dying and dressing of yarns, cloth and others on account of false dyes by persons professing what they either could not or would not perform.</i> " This had destroyed the value and credit of several kinds of coloured goods. The Deacon also outlined in his petition the rules by which the new Incorporation would operate. Ruling: The House agreed that the only way to improve the dying was for the Bonnetmakers and Dyers to receive a charter and seal of cause and empowered the Bonnetmakers and Dyers to apply to the magistrates	Volume 2, Page 443	September 1759
Cordiners	Cordiners	John Scott and Robert Gray both late Deacons of the Cordiners complained that John Bannatyne the present Deacon of the Cordiners had not followed the normal election procedure of the Masters, Box Masters, Clerk and Officer and they asked that election be declared null and void. Ruling: The House unanimously found that Deacon John Bannatyne had proceeded in an inappropriate manner in the election and therefore it was nul and void. John Bannatyne said that he would appeal to the magistrates and the House ruled that the business of the Cordiners would have to be carried out by the present Deacon and Masters etc., from the preceding year. John Bannatyne in open court said " <i>that he would not be trampled upon by a sett of prepossessed gentlemen and uttered other disrespectful expressions.</i> The House therefore classed and sett aside John Bannatyne from having any vote in any affairs of the House for six months. The House instructed William Lang, the Officer of the Cordiners to inform the old and present Box Masters of their decision and that it would stand until John Bannatynes' appeal was heard.	Volume 2, Page 448	December 1759

Tailors	Tailors	Deacon Robert Anderson and Collector Archibald McEwing presented a petition asking the House for support in a case to be heard before the Lords of Council and Session on the 12th and 19th June 1760, which had been taken out by Robert Whyte, a freeman tailor who had rejected the byelaws of the Incorporation. Ruling: The House advised and directed the Tailors to defend their byelaws by all legal methods and indicated that they would at all times be willing to give advice and reasonable assistance where necessary.	Volume 2, Page 450	April 1760
Cordiners	Trades House	Deacon John Bannatyne of the Cordiners presented a petition indicating most humbly that he had been guilty of an error and mistake in not obeying and fulfilling the sentences of the House for which he was sorry. He asked that he be allowed to carry out their wishes. Ruling: The House directed John Bannatyne to convene the members of the Cordiners and to elect a leet as for the proper election.	Volume 2, Page 450	April 1760
Maltmen	Maltmen	The Visitors and Masters of the Maltmen complained that John Stevenson had been elected Collector but refused to accept the office. An Act of the House on 29th November 1743 stipulated that non-acceptance unless under specified conditions would incur a fine of £6 sterling and they asked that John Stevenson be fined and the Maltmen instructed to carry out another election for a Collector. John Stevenson had sent a letter to the Deacon Convener indicating that his health was poor and would not be able to carry out the duties of Collector adequately and had enclosed £6 sterling in payment of the fine. Ruling: The House found that John Stevenson had refused to accept office and accepted his £6 as the fine which was passed to the Visitor for the use of the poor. The Convener ruled that John Stevenson should not be obliged to take any office in the Incorporation unless he felt fit to do so.	Volume 2, Page 459	December 1760

Weavers	Trades House	Alexander Riddell Deacon of the Weavers petitioned the House to support the Weavers by trying to have the law altered that allowed anyone to set up as a weaver in Glasgow. This law was making many of the Weavers poor men and attracting to the city men who were unskilled and would fail and become poor and a burden on the charity of the city. The quality of workmanship by these incomers was very low and brining bad repute to Glasgow. Ruling: The House agreed to approach the magistrates and town council for their advice and assistance to obtain redress of the grievance.	Volume 2, Page 461	June 1761
Trades House	Cordiner	It was reported to the House that John Finlay, Cordiner, at a public meeting of the Cordiners had several times cursed and swore at the meeting and called the Deacon Convener Daniell Munro, " <i>a damned bitch, bougor</i> " and called him many bad names and threatened him. The House was of the opinion that John Finlay brought to justice in front of the magistrate so that he might be fined and imprisoned.	Volume 2, Page 465	September 1761
Barbers	Barbers	A petition was presented by William Cassells and six other Barbers showing that they had offered to pay the ordinary fines to become members of the Barbers and had been refused by the Deacon Convener and Mr. Miller, the Deacon at that time, even though they had payed their fees etc., to the Collector and been booked by the clerk. At the vote for the Deacon, 36 voted for John Murdoch and 35 voted for William Cassells and that 5 who had been prevented from voting had cast their vote for William Cassells. Ruling: The House ruled that William Cassells should be Deacon of the Barbers.	Volume 2, Page 466	September 1761

Trades House	Bakers	The Deacon Convener and Walter Lang and others presented a petition claiming that the Bakers Deacon John Craig had connived to ensure that Masters who were opposed to his view of who should receive James Muirhead's Mortification were out of time when it came to vote for it. He also allowed 2 Box Masters to vote, who were not eligible. He secured the mortification for Robert Ainslie who was a little over 40 years old and had no wife or family and could earn 3/- sterling weekly as opposed to Patrick Lang, who had a wife and several children. Ruling: The House found that the election of Robert Ainslie to the poor man on the mortification to be irregular and that a new meeting should be convened and all warned well in advance.	Volume 2. Page 475	April 1763
Trades House	Bakers	Andrew Duncan and 4 other Bakers presented a petition asking that the House rescinds its last order to hold an election on James Muirhead's mortification as the money should be put to new apprentices wages and that there should be no new person on the mortification until a year has passed from the last vacancy. Ruling: The House ruled that James Muirhead had made a second mortification which covered the wages of the apprentices and he had revoked the year's clause. The Deacon was instructed to hold an election for the mortification. John Craig immediately protested and took the case to law.	Volume 2, Page 476	April 1763
Trades House	Bakers	Deacon John Craig produced an extract of James Muirhead's mortification which made it clear that there should be no new recipient until a year after the death of the last recipient. Ruling: The House ruled that the Bakers should hold a meeting and vote in a new recipient to take effect a year after the death of the last.	Volume 2, Page 478	April 1763
Trades House	Bakers	At a meeting of the patrons of Deacon James Muirhead's Mortifications to the Baker trade, ordained that Patrick Lang would be the new recipient of the mortification from Lambass.	Volume 2, Page 478	July 1763

Bakers	Bakers	Walter Lang the Collector of the Bakers complained to the House that John Craig the Deacon of the Bakers had admitted James Ure the son of deceased George Ure as a member of the Bakers even though he was only 13 years of age. Deacon John Craig admitted that he was in error. Ruling: The house ruled that James Ure's membership was null and void and that he could not be admitted until he was no longer a minor. The House found that Deacon John Craig should be censured and he appeared before the Deacon Convener where he was rebuked.	Volume 2, Page 481	September 1763
Trades House	Bakers	The House ordained that Patrick Lang should have a vote at elections within the Incorporation of Bakers even though he was enjoying the benefits of James Muirhead's mortification.	Volume 2, Page 481	September 1763
Cordiners	Cordiners	A petition and protest was presented by John Zuill, Nathaniel Jones, Archibald McAlister and William Ralston to the effect that the election of John Cummings to two offices, i.e., Collector and Master, was wrong and should be made null and void. The governance of the Cordiner should consist of: a Deacon, Collector and six Masters elected by the Deacon and six Masters elected by the trade and to goudies or Box Masters, one chosen by the Deacon and one chosen by the trade, in all 16 persons. Ruling: The House ruled that the election of John Cumming as Master was null and void and that a new leet should be drawn up for the election of a Master. The House also enacted that no person in any Incorporation shall hold two offices.	Volume 2, Page 489	January 1765
Wrights	Wrights	The Deacon of the Wrights, Archibald Buchanan complained that his Masters had, contrary to his remonstrance's, enrolled among their quarterly poor Margaret Morton widow of [] Drew, wright but is now the widow of Robert Will, quarrier which was against the rules of the Wrights. Ruling: The House found that the enrolment of Margaret Morton was irregular but felt that she should receive the two last payments of Candlemas and Beltan but receive no further quarterly money. She should only receive charity from the society among other common persons.	Volume 2, Page 491	July 1765

Coopers	Coopers	An appeal and complaint was made by John Urie, Cooper against the re-election of William Wilkie as officer to the Incorporation when he had been deposed by the Deacon and Masters as unfaithful in his office and irreverent and unmannerly to the Deacon and Masters and guilty of frequent and excessive drunkenness. Ruling: The House found William Wilkie unworthy of the office and that he could not be elected for a period of seven years. The Deacon was empowered to convene another meeting for the election of officer.	Volume 2, Page 491	July 1765
Gardeners	Gardeners	James Wilson and John McAulla, both late Deacons of the Gardeners gave in a petition claiming that at the last election of the Collector and Masters, the Deacon had added a name to the leet which had not been agreed by the Masters at a previous meeting and this was against the normal practice of the Incorporation of Gardeners. They asked that the election be found null and void. Ruling: The House ruled that the election was null and void and that a new election should take place in line with the Gardeners rules and traditions.	Volume 2, Page 512	October 1767
Gardeners	Gardeners	Deacon Thomas Barton and Collector William Bryce senior presented a petition to the House which asked that the House ratifies a change to the Gardeners" rules allowing the Deacon to select one person to be Collector, the Masters to select one person and the members to select one person and that these three would make up the leet for the election. It was believed that this would stop the disharmony that had arisen over the years during the election of Collector. Ruling: The House ratified the change to the Gardeners rules.	Volume 2, Page 515	April 1768
Masons	Masons	Deacon William Paull of the Masons presented a petition asking the House to ratify an act of the Masons which clarified that the Deacon could only be elected for one year and not be able to continue a second year. Ruling: The House ratified the act of the Masons,	Volume 2, Page 519	September 1768

Hammermen	Non Freemen	The House received a petition from William Lang junior, Deacon of the Hammermen when the petition was handed in on 30th June 1767 and Robert Miller, then Collector. The petition indicated that Archibald Bogle and John Edmonston, both merchants in Glasgow and Charles Colquhoun coach or chaisemaker had entered into a partnership for making coaches and chaises and other machines and working all of the iron work without being a freeman of the Hammermen. They also refused to make an essay or join the Incorporation and pay the ordinary dues. The Hammermen sought the advice of the House. Ruling: The House unanimously directed the Hammermen to pursue the case before the magistrates or any other court for a fine and damages and that they would be stopped working in iron until they joined the Incorporation.	Volume 2, Page 521	October 1768
Wrights	Wrights	The Deacon of the Wrights presented a petition asking the House to approve an act of the Wrights which would prevent freemen Wrights working with un freemen or claiming work done by unfreemen as their own or paying unfreemen journeymen higher wages than agreed by the Wrights. Failure to comply would be punishable by having to pay a new membership of the Wrights and lose his privileges until it is paid.	Volume 2, Page 522	April 1769
Tailors	Tailors	Archibald McQueen and several Tailors complained about the undue and illegal methods used to elect the last Officer of the Tailors. Ruling: The House found that the election of John Wallace was precipitantly and unwarrantably proceeded in and declared the election null and void. The House ordained that the Deacon John Couper had to convene another election for the election of the Officer of the Tailors.	Volume 2, Page 536	June 1771

Cordiners	Cordiners	Matthew Montgomerie, a freeman member of the Cordiners complained to the House that he had been a member of the Cordiners for 2 years even though he had not made an essay. During this time he had been allowed to vote in all elections, but now his name has been take off the qualified role and the reason stated was that he had not made an essay. He asked the House for redress. Ruling: The House ruled that the Cordiners should add his name to the qualified role and that he should be allowed to vote in all Cordiner elections.	Volume 2, Page 539	September 1771
Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners and Maltmen	Trades House	The Deacons of the Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners and Maltmen exhibited and put into the hands of John Wardrop, Clerk to the House, letters of suspension against the Deacon Convener and the Deacons of the Incorporations of Weavers, Bakers, Skinners, Wrights, Coopers, Fleshers, Masons, Gardeners, Barbers and Bonnetmakers & Dyers dated 11th September 1771 concerning an act of the Trades House dated 12th June 1771 for continuing the trades baillie a member of the House after expiry of his office. (See page 535 of Lumsden, Volume 2). And the petition presented by the other 10 Deacons to have equal representation in the House. The suspension was read to the House so that they could not deny knowledge of it and therefore could not implement the equal representation of members without the risk of legal proceedings against them.	Volume 2, Page 539	September 1771
Tailors	Tailors	A complaint had been made by Deacon Alexander Farquhar of the Tailors that at a meeting of the Tailors, two Masters John Miller and George Blair had insulted and maltreated him and threatened to turn him out of his chair. A committee had been appointed to gather evidence and report back to the House. Ruling: The House voted on whether the culprits should be classed or rebooked and by the Deacon Convener's vote, they agreed to class them. A second vote was then put concerning the length of time that they should be classed: either one year; two years or three years. By a majority of votes it was agreed to	Volume 2, Page 550	December 1772

		class them for one year. Therefore John Miller and George Blair could not bear any office or vote in the Tailors for one year.		
Hammermen	Hammermen	A petition was presented by Stephen Maxwell and six Hammermen indicating at the election of the Collector and Masters, Deacon John Thomson scored his name out from the qualified role and as fourth in the leet for election of Master. When it came to the election of leet position 4, he was elected by a majority of votes (88 votes), but Deacon Thomson refused the result and put David Hendrie (49 votes), saddler in his place. Stephen Maxwell asked the clerk to record two protests, but the clerk indicated that the Deacon had taken the sederunt book and would not allow any entries until he knew their contents. Stephen Tomson then showed the Deacon the two protests and the Deacon accepted one but refused the other. Ruling: The House ruled that the Masters should draw up a leet and the Deacon should ll on the qualified roll should be allowed to vote.	Volume 2, Page 556	October 1773
Masons	Masons	A petition was presented by William Horn, mason and Daniel Wardrop, late Deacon of the masons complaining that William Horn had been struck off the qualified roll of the Masons when he had paid his journeymen's dues of 2/- each and as he had 10 journeymen, he had paid the Collector 20/-. In his absence it was voted that he should be struck off the roll as he was not present to confirm the number of journeymen that he employed. He asked the House for redress. Ruling: The House ruled that William Horn should be added to the Masons qualified roll and be allowed to vote in elections.	Volume 2, Page 566	September 1775

Wrights	Wrights	A petition in the name of the Incorporation of Wrights was presented which indicated that to be placed on the qualified roll, members must have cleared their debts to the Incorporation by Lambass and that in August each year the leets for offices were to be made up and no changes to be made after that time. On 15th September the Deacons and Masters voted on whether John Craig should be added to the qualified role, even though he was in arrears of mortcloths. He also owed booking money for a journeyman. A vote was taken that John Craig was not a debtor and was therefore added to the qualified roll. Ruling: The House, after hearing evidence from the Deacon and others and examining the minute book decided that John Craig should be struck from the qualified roll and not be able to vote in the ensuing election.	Volume 2, Page 567	September 1776
Barbers/Wrights	Barbers	Deacon Charles Murray and five Masters of the Barbers presented a petition outlining that Alexander Park, the Collector had refused to pay Daniell Begg, Wright, £7 19s sterling the price of a Box made by him for the Incorporation of Barbers as instructed by the Deacon and Masters. Alexander Park refused to pay this due debt even after being instructed by the Deacon and Masters. Ruling: After hearing evidence from all concerned the House ruled that Alexander Park was in the wrong in disobeying his Deacon and Masters and that he should pay the account and appear before the Barbers Deacon and Masters and apologise for his disobedience.	Volume 2, Page 552	May 1773

Index by Complaint

Complainant	Against	Debate	Location	Date
Baker	Baker	Baillie Thomas Scott, baker and seven others complained that the election of the Masters had been carried out improperly and was therefore null and void. Ruling: The House investigated the complaint and found it to be true and therefore the election was null and void. The Deacon Convener instructed Deacon John Auchinclos to reconvene the trade and to elect the Masters in accordance with previous practice.	Volume 2, Page 439	October 1758
Bakers	Bakers	The Bakers put forward a petition complaining about Zacharias Allason being made a Masters of the trade. Ruling: the House ruled that Zacharias Allason should not be made a Master of the Bakers.	Volume 2, Page 265	May 1740
Bakers	Bakers	John Buchanan, present Deacon of the Bakers had violated and broken the act of the Bakers preventing anyone bearing office of Deacon for more than one year and had himself elected as Deacon for a second year. Ruling: The Bakers were instructed to meet and choose a Master from last year as their Deacon for year to come.	Volume 1, Page 364	October 1660
Bakers	Bakers	A complaint was made to the House by Thomas Mitchell, baker against the Deacon, Collector and Masters of the Bakers for allowing the Collector John Charity to not pay a debt of 5/- which was a fee paid by booking Zacharias Allason's apprentice and which had not been banked. Ruling: The House appointed a subcommittee to investigate and report back.	Volume 2, Page 306	December 1743

Bakers	Bakers	The sub-committee reported back on the complaint made to the House by Thomas Mitchell, baker against the Deacon, Collector and Masters of the Bakers for allowing the Collector John Charity to not pay a debt of 5/- which was a fee paid by booking Zacharias Allason's apprentice and which had not been banked. Ruling: The House found the judges that the Deacon and Masters had not applied to the House and had shown indignity to it. They also insisted that the new Collector should receive from the old Collector of the Bakers, John Charity, 5/- and cautioned the present Deacon of the Bakers, from doing this type of action again.	Volume 2, Page 309	April 1774
Bakers	Bakers	The House considered that Andrew Scott, Deacon of the Bakers was living mainly in the country and not attending House or many Craft meetings. Ruling: The House ruled that Andrew Scott could not be voted in as Deacon in the coming year or any future years whilst he resided in the country. He also lost the benefits of being a member of the House. No person in any trade can hold office in a trade if they reside mainly in the country.	Volume 2, Page 332	September 1746
Bakers	Bakers	William Thomson and 5 other bakers complained that William Gilmour, John Auchincloss and James Yuill and their followers, some of whom were not qualified, had chosen and elected some unqualified managers to the trade. They asked that the wrongdoers should be punished. William Gilmour had as Deacon at the time had allowed Andrew Scott to be voted on to become Deacon whilst an act of the House made it clear that he should not whilst he resided in the country. Ruling: the House appointed late Deacon James Morrison to convene the craft and to elect a new Deacon out of the previous year's Masters.	Volume 2, Page 338	October 1746
Bakers	Bakers	William Thomson and other bakers brought to the attention of the House that they had asked the that William Gilmour, John Auchincloss and James Yuill should be punished and should not be allowed to be leated or have a vote or be voted on on any election. Ruling: As John Auchincloss was baptised on 7th	Volume 2, Page 338	October 1746

		January 1728 and was therefore 18 years old and under age. The House ruled that William Gilmour was not to have any vote or in any election or be voted on or be a member of the House for 7 years. John Achincloss and James Yuill cannot be voted on or bear office for one year and that John Auchincloss nor any freeman of any Incorporation, can during their minority, bear the office of Deacon, Master or Collector or be a member of the House.		
Bakers	Bakers	Walter Lang the Collector of the Bakers complained to the House that John Craig the Deacon of the Bakers had admitted James Ure the son of deceased George Ure as a member of the Bakers even though he was only 13 years of age. Deacon John Craig admitted that he was in error. Ruling: The house ruled that James Ure's membership was null and void and that he could not be admitted until he was no longer a minor. The House found that Deacon John Craig should be censured and he appeared before the Deacon Convener where he was rebuked.	Volume 2, Page 481	September 1763
Barbers	Barbers	John Tassie petitioned the House to make the Barbers accept him as a freeman as he had served his time with William Ewing (Barber) for three years and a further two years with John McAuley (Barber), in the art of trimming, shaving etc. Ruling: The House found that John Tassie had served a total of five years and saw no reason why he should not become a freeman and the Barbers were instructed to allow him to join their craft.	Volume 2, Page 68	July 1772

Barbers	Barbers	Charles Andersonne and John Robertstone barbers complained that George Buchanan, the Deacon at the time had in a violent manner refused to allow the clerk to read out the names of those who owed money to the craft or were receiving charity from it. 22 who did not owe money voted for Charles Andersonne and 22 voted for Alexander Leggatt, 4 of which owed money to the craft. The Deacon owed 4/- to the trade and he also cast the casting vote. Ruling: The House ruled that the procedures followed were flawed and that the Barbers were to reconvene and hold another election on 10th October and that George Buchanan, the last Deacon should preside and act as Deacon.	Volume 2, Page 129	September 1727
Barbers	Barbers	Alexander Leggat and George Buchanan barbers in Glasgow gave in a petition claiming that there were more members who voted for Charles Andersonne who were debtors than had voted for Alexander Leggatt and that he should have been made Deacon due to the majority of votes. Ruling: The House ruled that Alexander Leggatt should be made Deacon and take the oath <i>de fidei administratione officii</i> .	Volume 2, Page 134	May 1728
Barbers	Barbers	John Buchanan late apprentice to John McAuley had received his indentures discharge and had applied to the Deacon of the Barbers to be admitted as a freeman even after he produced his indentures and Burgess ticket. Ruling: The House instructed the Deacon of the Barbers to convene his Masters and admit John Buchanan to an essay.	Volume 2, Page 161	March 1731
Barbers	Barbers	John Luke barber gave in a petition indicating that they had objected to the election of Robert Wallace as Deacon as he was not qualified to be made Deacon as his burgess ticket was <i>free gratis</i> . 23 had voted for Robert Wallace and 20 voted for William Keighny who was <i>burgess and Guild brother</i> . Ruling: The House ruled that as Robert Wallace had been a Master for a year and was now a burgess, he should be accepted as the Deacon of the Barbers and sworn in accordingly.	Volume 2, Page 167	September 1731

Barbers	Barbers	A complaint was made by Andrew Younger concerning the illegal election of John Weir as Deacon of the Barbers as he was a debtor. Ruling: the House found that John Weir was not a debtor at the time of his election and therefore his election was legal and that he should be sworn in as Deacon.	Volume 2, Page 182	November 1732
Barbers	Barbers	Robert Wallace Deacon of the Barbers complained that he had chosen Alexander Miln and John Cruickshanks as two of his masters, the trade refused to accept them. Ruling: The House instructed the Deacon to meet and warn the trade to accept the chosen Masters and if they do not he should name others in their stead.	Volume 2, Page 183	November 1732
Barbers	Barbers	Ruling: The House ruled that as John Weir was elected as a Master of the Barbers, ordained that he be received as a Master of that trade.	Volume 2, Page 183	November 1732
Barbers	Barbers	John Luke, barber complained that the Deacon and Masters had refused to book an apprentice unless he had payed £8 scots (the five years of his former apprentice's apprenticeship not being run) even though his new apprenticeship was only started 28 days before the end of the 5th year of his former apprentices' apprenticeship. Ruling: As John Luke had taken an apprentice before the end of his previous apprentices' indenture, that he aught to pay the £8 scots for the use of the poor before he can get the new apprentice booked.	Volume 2, Page 187	June 1733

Barbers	Barbers	Robert Paull, Deacon and John Craig, Collector of the Barbers, presented a petition which they asked to ratify the enclosed acts of the Barbers dated 14th September 1746 which was a) Before any freeman enters as a journeyman to work, he should inform the Deacon and within 3 months and pay his booking money. If a Master fails to intimate to the Deacon or pay his journeyman's booking fee he shall be fined 20/- scots for the use of the poor. b) All Barbers who wish to sell their wigs out of town or further must take their wigs for inspection to the visitor inspector and stampmaster of wigs nominate in order that they can be inspected for quality and if appropriate they would be stamped with the trade stamp. c) The visitor and stampmaster to levy each wig of 2 pence sterling for their own use. Any member making and selling wigs without being stamped would be fined 5/- sterling per wig for the use of the poor. Ruling: The House ratified and approved the acts.	Volume 2, Page 331	September 1746
Barbers	Barbers	A petition was presented by the Deacon and Collector of the Barbers indicating that the Barber journeymen, servants and apprentices had been used to working from six in the morning to nine at night without complaint until several journeymen had joined together and would not work later than from six in the morning to eight at night. If this was allowed to happen the Barbers would have to raise the cost of their work and that the their servants would waste the extra time on drinking etc and not be fit to work the next day. The Barbers proposed that any Master who did not ensure that their servants worked from six in the morning to nine at night would be banned from voting or holding office for seven years and be fined £10 scots. Ruling: The House ratified the Barbers statute with the exception that Masters could allow their servants to stop at eight-o-clock at night if they were advancing their knowledge by going to school in the evening.	Volume 2, Page 375	October 1750

Barbers	Barbers	Duncan Niven and other Barbers complained about Andrew Duncan, Deacon of the Barbers who had prevented James Selkirk, a member of the Barbers and past officer being put on a leet to be officer. Walter King, the Barbers poor man in the Hospital, had been elected instead. Duncan Niven requested that the Deacon should be censured for his actions. Ruling: A petition was presented indicating that James Selkirk had several malpractices and misdemeanours against him and an act of the Barbers against him finding him to be unworthy to be the officer. The House ratified Andrew Younger's actions and found James Selkirk incapable of being officer for seven years.	Volume 2, Page 377	October 1750
Barbers	Barbers	A petition was presented by William Cassells and six other Barbers showing that they had offered to pay the ordinary fines to become members of the Barbers and had been refused by the Deacon Convener and Mr. Miller, the Deacon at that time, even though they had paid their fees etc., to the Collector and been booked by the clerk. At the vote for the Deacon, 36 voted for John Murdoch and 35 voted for William Cassells and that 5 who had been prevented from voting had cast their vote for William Cassells. Ruling: The House ruled that William Cassells should be Deacon of the Barbers.	Volume 2, Page 466	September 1761
Barbers	Barbers and Surgeons	Alexander Milne Deacon of the Barbers presented a petition to the House indicating that in 1656 the freemen surgeons and barbers became one incorporation. On 19th December 1719 all of the surgeon signed a writ which in effect meant that they renounced and surrendered their privileges and the Town Council have agreed that as far as they are concerned, the letter of Deaconry was void and extinct as far as the surgeons were concerned. On 22nd September 1722 the Barbers received their new letter of Deaconry. On 28th September 1722 the Barbers met and elected Alexander Milne as their Deacon. The Barbers therefore petitioned the House to admit the Deacon and two other representatives as representatives on the House.	Volume 2, Page 76	October 1722

		Ruling: The House unanimously agreed.		
Barbers	Trades House	John Robertson the last Deacon of the Barbers has now quit his house and is living in the country, craved to be released from his duties to the House. Ruling: The House so released him.	Volume 2, Page 170	October 1731
Barbers	Trades House	John Cars, Deacon of the Barbers submitted a petition requesting that Alexander Edwards, Andrew Haltridge, William McLean, William Cassills, Robert Stevenson and John Craig have their sentence of 19th November 1754 set aside and be allowed to vote and be voted on in elections of the craft. Ruling: The House agreed to the petition and they would be allowed to vote and be voted on as long as they were not debtors to the craft.	Volume 2, Page 429	September 1757
Barbers/Wrights	Barbers	Deacon Charles Murray and five Masters of the Barbers presented a petition outlining that Alexander Park, the Collector had refused to pay Daniell Begg, Wright, £7 19s sterling the price of a Box made by him for the Incorporation of Barbers as instructed by the Deacon and Masters. Alexander Park refused to pay this due debt even after being instructed by the Deacon and Masters. Ruling: After hearing evidence from all concerned the House ruled that Alexander Park was in the wrong in disobeying his Deacon and Masters and that he should pay the account and appear before the Barbers Deacon and Masters and apologise for his disobedience.	Volume 2, Page 552	May 1773
Bonnetmakers	Bonnetmakers	Ruling: Having heard several complaints about the election of Alexander Winzeat as Deacon of the Bonnetmakers. In the meantime the House appointed John Wylie, the last Deacon to officiate as Deacon while the House fully considered and determined the election.	Volume 2, Page 302	October 1743
Bonnetmakers	Last Deacon	For injuring the Deacon and withholding the crafts ben and garttaines. Ruling: Last Deacon was fined and had to ask forgiveness for his acts.	Volume 1, Page 48,	November 1613

Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Bonnetmakers and Dyers	John James and David Wylie, bonnetmakers in Glasgow presented a petition asking the House to ratify a statute that they had enacted after they had received a goodly number of freemen into the incorporation on 8th November 1742, where they agreed that the Deacon would be a practicing bonnetmaker one year and any of the craft the next and so on... As the Incorporation had not had this statute ratified by the House, they asked for ratification and guidance. Ruling: The House ratified the statute of the Bonnetmakers and Dyers and laid down 12 rules which they had to follow.	Volume 2, Page 310	July 1744
Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Robert Marshall Deacon of the Dyers and Bonnetmakers petitioned that as they had little or no common stock or fund for the poor, had appointed a committee to find ways of augmenting their funds. They had since enacted a statute that every freeman who used indigo in the dying trade, should pay 2 pennies scots for each pound of indigo used; every freeman who does not practice the dying trade should pay 2/- sterling yearly. Ruling: The House unanimously ratified the statute and authorised the Deacon and Collector and their successors to levy the members.	Volume 2, Page 318	June 1745
Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Bonnetmakers and Dyers	Alexander Ralph the Deacon of the Bonnetmakers and Dyers presented a petition which requested that the House support them in becoming a recognised Incorporation. The reason that this was necessary was that " <i>there had been great abuses in the colouring, dying and dressing of yarns, cloth and others on account of false dyes by persons professing what they either could not or would not perform.</i> " This had destroyed the value and credit of several kinds of coloured goods. The Deacon also outlined in his petition the rules by which the new Incorporation would operate. Ruling: The House agreed that the only way to improve the dying was for the Bonnetmakers and Dyers to receive a charter and seal of cause and empowered the Bonnetmakers and Dyers to apply to the magistrates	Volume 2, Page 443	September 1759

Cooper	Cooper	The Coopers complained about James Scheillis concerning the election of the Deacon. John Smythe lied and falsified the evidence and when challenged he admitted it. Ruling: James Scheillis was fined £3 and John Smythe was fined as well, the money to go to the weill of the poor.	Volume 1, Page 86	November 1619
Cooper	Cooper	A complaint by a number of Coopers was made alleging that the poor were not receiving a fair amount from the Craft and that there was some dodgy business going on. Ruling: The craft were instructed in detail how to behave in a fair and proper manner.	Volume 1, Page 191	August 1638
Coopers	Coopers	Robert Marschell, Deacon of the Coopers complained that his officer Johne Gemill was disobedient and misbehaved himself to the Deacon. Ruling: Johne Gemill was fined 10 merks instead of the £5 as fined by his craft and if he misbehaves or disobeys again he will lose his liberty of his craft.	Volume 1, Page 343	May 1657
Coopers	Coopers	Robert Marschell, the late Deacon of the Coopers complained that Cuthbert Grege, the present Deacon of the Coopers had prevented him from becoming a member of the Master Court when he should have been the first Master and holder of the special key to the craft Box. Ruling: Cuthbert Grege to make Robert Marschell one of the first Masters of the craft for the coming year and to give him the special key to the craft Box as is and has been the custom. In future no new Deacon shall put the old Deacon off the Master Court and he shall be given the special key to the craft Box.	Volume 1, Page 363	October 1660
Coopers	Coopers	Cuthbert Greg, Deacon of the Coopers was instructed to return 10 marks to William Pollok that they had taken from him for sending his apprentice abroad for the service of the country and to win his living and to help his master.	Volume 1, Page 372	August 1661

Coopers	Coopers	A number of Coopers complained that the present Deacon had charged them too much to join the craft, especially as they were the sons of freemen and that there was not a consistent level of charges for membership. Ruling: the Deacon and the craft were tasked to set the fee for freemen sons at £16 and that this should become part of the Coopers statutes.	Volume 1, Page 401	May 1665
Coopers	Coopers	The Deacon of the Coopers and other members of the Coopers complained that Johne Gemmil (Cooper). Ruling: The Deacon of the Coopers or some representing him should go to Dumbarton with Johne Gemmil and purchase the rest of the staves that are not sold and also 3500 girthies already purchased by Johne Gemmill to be equally divided between the members of the Coopers and if there were no girthies in Dumbarton, Johne Gemmil should divide his amongst the craft and they recompensing him.	Volume 1, Page 401	March 1665
Coopers	Coopers	Johne Gemmill submitted himself to the Craft and the House and would follow the rules of the Craft in future or be fined £40 for the use of the poor. Ruling: In future all Coopers will submit to the rules of the Craft and none should buy rungs abroad either in burghs or landwort except that the bargain will be for the whole Craft.	Volume 1, Page 402	April 1665
Coopers	Coopers	Ruling: All staves, girthes, steps and others of that kind imported at the Broomilaw should be purchased for the Craft and each member should have his share as long as they had paid for their previous shares.	Volume 1, Page 403	May 1665
Coopers	Coopers	Cuthbert Greg the Deacon of the Coopers complained that a number of his Masters hindered him in enrolling Robert Gibsone as a journeyman with Johne Nisbet. Ruling: Robert Gibsone should be enrolled and that the five named Masters should be warded in the Tolbooth for disobeying their Deacon and Johne Pollock and James Ingraham (two of the above named) should be warded in close ward and that each of the five should be fined a new membership of the Coopers.	Volume 1, Page 414	November 1666

Coopers	Coopers	The Deacon of the Coopers brought a complaint against William Shiells, Johne Scott and Johne Neisbit (Coopers) for breaking an act agreed to by Walter Neilson, Deacon Convener at a meeting of the House on 8th November 1665, whereby any rungs staves splits etc. purchased should be sold to the Burges of the Trade equally and that the above named had purchased rungs and refused to share them amongst the craft. Ruling: The three were instructed to sell to their brethren proportionally their share of the rungs. The Deacon Convenor ruled that in future if any Cooper purchased staves, rungs etc. more than 6 miles from the Burgh, they may keep them for themselves.	Volume 1, Page 481	April 1674
Coopers	Coopers	Ninian Urie cooper complained that there was an act in the Coopers which meant that journeymen had to make an essay (trade test piece) before they were allowed to serve the House. Ruling: The House found it unreasonable for journeymen to have to make an essay and ordained that they be allowed to serve without an essay and any Coopers Acts to the contrary should be rescinded.	Volume 2, Page 172	March 1732
Coopers	Coopers	Deacon Duncan Campbell petitioned that late Deacon Peter Leckie for admitting Robert Hood, Hammerman; Andrew Younger and William Kirkland, barbers as members of the Cooper trade on the date of the Deacon's election and allowing them to vote in that election. 20 of the trade voted for Robert Auchincloss and 18 voted for Robert Robertson to be Deacon. Ruling: The House ruled that the three new members had a right to vote and that Robert Auchincloss was duly elected Deacon and should take the oath <i>de fideli administratione</i> .	Volume 2, Page 365	September 1749.

Coopers	Coopers	An appeal and complaint was made by John Urie, Cooper against the re-election of William Wilkie as officer to the Incorporation when he had been deposed by the Deacon and Masters as unfaithful in his office and irreverent and unmannerly to the Deacon and Masters and guilty of frequent and excessive drunkenness. Ruling: The House found William Wilkie unworthy of the office and that he could not be elected for a period of seven years. The Deacon was empowered to convene another meeting for the election of officer.	Volume 2, Page 491	July 1765
Coopers	Fleshers	George McRae, Deacon of the Coopers gave in a petition stating that the Coopers, in times past, were ranked before the Fleshers and that for some reason this has been altered for the past number of years. He requested that the Coopers be returned to their precedence in the House. Ruling: The House accepted the Coopers case and the ranking in the Trades House was listed as: Hammermen; Tailors; Cordiners; Maltmen; Weavers; Bakers; Skinners; Wrights; Coopers; Fleshers; Masons; Gardeners; Barbers; Bonnetmakers and Dyers.	Volume 2, Page 385	April 1752
Cordiners	Bakers and Tanners	Hew Andersoune and James Mitchell Cordiners and shoemakers, complained that the Barkers and Tanners (Cordiners) were supplying insufficient quantities of leather to the shoemakers. They asked that the most qualified shoemakers become masters in equal numbers to the barkers and tanners to enable fair votes to take place. Ruling: The six most qualified shoemakers should become Masters in the Cordiners and that in future they should be half shoemakers and half Barkers and Tanners.	Volume 1, Page 340	January 1657

Cordiners	Cordiners	Three members of the Cordiners on behalf of the Cordiners and tanners, placed a complaint indicating that when they were in office, they and their predecessors were very active in collecting money for the poor decayed brethren and that when they were in power they had made a bargain with the Laird of Kinkaid to loan him 800 marks on top of 200 that he already owed and that this would be on a Band. Now Johne Wood the present Deacon is refusing to keep the agreement and intends to loan the money to Thomas Dobbie, brother-in-law to Johne Wood with some old property as collateral. The present Deacon, Johne Wood has also taken the Box key from the past Deacon James Mitchell and this has not been allowed for 40 years. Ruling: The money should be lent to the Laird of Kinkaid upon sufficient security and that the Box key be returned to Late Deacon James Mitchell.	Volume 1, Page 414	November 1666
Cordiners	Cordiners	Archibald Scott the Deacon of the Cordiners complained about the encroachment of outentown Cordiners and unfreemen in the burgh. Ruling: The House appointed Archibald Scott, Deacon of the Cordiners to go to Edinburgh with others to assist him to advise lawyers and to do whatever else they could to stoop the encroachment.	Volume 2, Page 207	June 1735
Cordiners	Cordiners	James Hunter the Deacon of the Cordiners claiming that the benefits and privileges of many of the Incorporations were being encroached by unfreemen and that James Bannatyne , a freeman Cordiners seized a pair of shoes brought into the city for sale by William McAuley in Caltun an unfreeman. This has always been the right of any freeman finding the sale of goods outside mercat days. The Procurator Fiscal William Weir had indicted him for robbery and that the privileges of all the Incorporations were under threat band hoped that the House would join with the Cordiners in defending James Bannatyne. Ruling: The House appointed a sub-committee to meet with the magistrates with a view to protect the trade privileges.	Volume 2, Page 216	August 1736

Cordiners	Cordiners	Ruling: The House ruled that the Cordiners were correct to defend James Bannatyne and that the House would pay a share in the cost of defending him.		
Cordiners	Cordiners	John Scott and Robert Gray both late Deacons of the Cordienrs complained that John Bannatyne the present Deacon of the Cordiners had not followed the normal election procedure of the Masters, Box Masters, Clerk and Officer and they asked that election be declared null and void. Ruling: The House unanimously found that Deacon John Bannatyne had proceeded in an inappropriate manner in the election and therefore it was null and void. John Bannatyne said that he would appeal to the magistrates and the House ruled that the business of the Cordiners would have to be carried out by the present Deacon and Masters etc., from the preceding year. John Bannatyne in open court said " <i>that he would not be trampled upon by a sett of prepossessed gentlemen and uttered other disrespectful expressions.</i> The House therefore classed and sett aside John Bannatyne from having any vote in any affairs of the House for six months. The House instructed William Lang, the Officer of the Cordiners to inform the old and present Box Masters of their decision and that it would stand until John Bannatynes' appeal was heard.	Volume 2, Page 448	December 1759

Cordiners	Cordiners	A petition and protest was presented by John Zuill, Nathaniel Jones, Archibald McAlister and William Ralston to the effect that the election of John Cummings to two offices, i.e., Collector and Master, was wrong and should be made null and void. The governance of the Cordiner should consist of: a Deacon, Collector and six Masters elected by the Deacon and six Masters elected by the trade and to goudies or Box Masters, one chosen by the Deacon and one chosen by the trade, in all 16 persons. Ruling: The House ruled that the election of John Cumming as Master was null and void and that a new leet should be drawn up for the election of a Master. The House also enacted that no person in any Incorporation shall hold two offices.	Volume 2, Page 489	January 1765
Cordiners	Cordiners	Matthew Montgomerie, a freeman member of the Cordiners complained to the House that he had been a member of the Cordiners for 2 years even though he had not made an essay. During this time he had been allowed to vote in all elections, but now his name has been take off the qualified role and the reason stated was that he had not made an essay. He asked the House for redress. Ruling: The House ruled that the Cordiners should add his name to the qualified role and that he should be allowed to vote in all Cordiner elections.	Volume 2, Page 539	September 1771
Cordiners	Trades House	Deacon John Bannatyne of the Cordiners presented a petition indicating most humbly that he had been guilty of an error and mistake in not obeying and fulfilling the sentences of the House for which he was sorry. He asked that he be allowed to carry out their wishes. Ruling: The House directed John Bannatyne to convene the members of the Cordiners and to elect a leet as for the proper election.	Volume 2, Page 450	April 1760

Deacon Convenor	All Crafts	church within the burgh as has happened previously. Ruling: Any Deacon contravening this ruling would have to pay £5 and that every Deacon bring his quarterly accounts to the hospital and to pay £5 to the Collector of the House for the use of the poor rather than making the Craft's Collectors pay as has happened before on pain of £5 fine.	Volume 1, Page 253	August 1647
Deacon Convenor	All Crafts	Deacon Convenor Manasses Lyle commented that some of the members of the crafts had misbehaved in front of the Deacon Convenor. Ruling: Any craftsmen who miscarry or misbehave in outrageous or vilifying speeches as has been used by some in the past to the Deacon Convenor or Deacon of his calling, in private or public shall after a suitable trial and found guilty, be banned from holding office in his craft or the House.	Volume 1, Page 323	October 1655
Deacon Convenor	All Crafts	For some time it had been understood that Deacons should not hold office for more than one year as it had made much evil and wrong in the craft. Ruling: No person whatsoever to be Deacon for more than one year under pain of £100 scots.	Volume 1, Page 363	October 1660
Deacon Convenor	Barbers and Others	The Deacon Convenor noted that the Barbers were drinking and debouching on the way home from the kirk to the great offence of God. Ruling: If anyone in the burgh was caught drinking or profaning, they would be fined 20 shillings for each fault.	Volume 1, Page 192	August 1638
Deacon Convenor	Coopers	The Coopers spent money intended for the poor on drinking and other uses to the great offence of God hurt and prejudice of the poor. Ruling: The Deacon and members of the Coopers were instructed to spend their money on the poor and other good and pious uses and that their accounts be checked in future by the Deacon Convenor.	Volume 1, Page 224	March 1643

Deacon Convenor	Coopers	Cuthbert Greg, the late Deacon of the Coopers had refused to render the box as he had been commanded several times on command of the Deacon Convenor and had refused to attend the House meeting as instructed. Ruling: The magistrates were " <i>acquainted to ward him until he is sensible and pays £10 fine to the poor</i> " and he was banned from holding office in his craft until he gives satisfaction to the House.	Volume 1, Page 278	November 1649
Deacon Convenor	Coopers	Cuthbert Greg, the Deacon of the Coopers was ordered to pay Jonet Hill a widow of the craft, double of what she shall be found to want. Due to his former ignoring of House Acts he is to do this in the sight of the Deacon Convenor and the Visitor of the Maltmen, William Boyd.	Volume 1, Page 372	August 1661
Deacon Convenor	Hammermen	The Deacon of the Hammermen was instructed to convene his key Masters and to bring the Craft Box before the House so that it could be opened and the act against Alexander Jaffray be deleted and scored out.	Volume 1, Page 372	August 1661
Deacon Convenor	Poor Men of the Hospital	[] Naysmith and John Currie, two poor men in the hospital were accused of bad miscarriage. Ruling: Both were ordered to remove themselves from the hospital and not to be readmitted until the give better testimony to their good carriage.	Volume 1, Page 347	August 1657
Deacon Convenor	Tailors	Patrik Adame was ordained to pay £5 to the poor which he had failed to do so on 29th May 1642 for his rude carriage before the Deacon Convenor and brethren of the Counsel. Ruling: Patrik Adame would never hold rank in his Craft until he pays the fine and made full satisfaction to the Deacon Convenor and all the Deacons and their brethren counsel for his wrong doings.	Volume 1, Page 226	August 1643
Deacon Convenor	Wrights	James Baird a Wright was accused by the Deacon Convenor of misbehaviour and disobedience towards the Deacon Convenor. Ruling: James Baird was fined £10 which was to be used to support the poor. He also had to crave of the Deacon Convenor for his wrong and homage or warding of his person	Volume 1, Page 105	July 1623

Deacon Convenor	Wrights	James Elphisoun, Glass Wright and John Daniell, Wright had done some wrong to the late Deacon Convenor Manasses Lyle. Ruling: They were banned from carrying out their trade until they gave satisfaction for their wrong to Manassesd Lyle.	Volume 1, Page 328	November 1655
Deacon Convenor	Wrights	The Deacon of the Wrights and members of the Wrights had sent Harie Ore to the Tolbooth in Stirling. No substantial evidence was given against Harie Ore. Ruling: The Deacon of the Wrights and the whole Craft were instructed to send for Harie Ore and to return him the Glasgow as a freeman and to pay all expenses. The Wrights also had to reply positively within ten hours and carry out the above instructions or they would be disowned.	Volume 1, Page 352	May 1658
Deacon Convenor	Wrights	The Deacon and others had removed 300 marks to lend to Camstrodden which they should not have done. Ruling: Robert Reid in Drygait was given the key to the Wrights box until Michaelmas next which James Reid held and recommends that the Deacons of the Tailors, Weavers, Skinners and Masons, with the Box Masters of the Wrights, should visit the Wrights Box to ensure that no harm has been done to it by the Deacon.	Volume 1, Page 401	May 1665
Dyers	Dyers	Johne Lindsay, Litster (Dyer), complained that Gorg Findlay and Nicoll Edglie litsters (dyers) had broken common equipment after Johne Lindsay had repaired them. Ruling: Gorg Finflay and Nicoll Edglie had to pay Johne Lindsay £7 he had paid out in making the repair and the culprits were instructed to repair the equipment as new at their own cost.	Volume 1, Page 322	August 1655
Dyers	Dyers	Mathow Bourne and Nicoll Edglie, Listers (Dyers) were found guilty of the most shameful abusing and upbraiding of their present headsman and oversman Johne Lindsay with filthy and detestable words not worthy of repeating. Ruling: They were both fined 19 merks and they were to give full satisfaction to Johne Lindsay and they were also to be held in the Tolbooth until they gave satisfaction to their headsman.	Volume 1, Page 329	March 1625

Dyers	Dyers	Due to the misbehaviour of Mathow Bourne and Nicoll Edglie, Listers (Dyers) the Deacon Convenor met with all of the Dyers and made it clear that filthy and shameless abuse given to their headsman and oversman was unacceptable. Ruling: The Listers would in future behave in a Christian manner towards their headsman, they would pay £4 for the booking of each apprentice, £4 for each journeyman or servant not serving an apprenticeship in the burgh and none of them shall lit cloth (dye cloth) for James Smith in Duntocher, Alexander Findlay in Kirkintilloch, Robert Thomson in Paisly or to any person outwith the burgh who claim to by Listers or any dealings with unfreemen under pain of £40 fine.	Volume 1, Page 330	March 1656
Fleshers	Fleshers	Andrew Watsounne (Flesher) complained that the Deacon of the Fleshers refused to admit him as a freeman of the Fleshers and Burgess and Guild Brethren and a freeman's son of a Flesher. Ruling: The Deacon with George Broom, Alexander Holmes and William Gilmour should produce their book because for the past three years they had refused to have their accounts audited. They flatly denied to do so. Ruling: They were all charged to remain in ward until they complied. The books were then produced and found to have missing entry money and other errors. They were instructed to admit Andrew Watsounne and to enter him and his money in the book and that they must show the book to the Deacon Convenor in future.	Volume 1, Page 420	May 1667
Fleshers	Fleshers	Alexander Park was accused of calling Johnne Barrie, Deacon of the Fleshers " <i>a knawe and a liar</i> ". Ruling: Alexander Park was fined £5 16s and the money to be given to James Jap for his supply. Alexander Park was also instructed to give satisfaction to the Deacon.	Volume 1, Page 461	February n1672

Fleshers	Fleshers	Matthew Lawson, younger a freeman Flesher petitioned that at the last election of their Collector, Archibald Alexander was put forward as Collector and was successful even though many had objected on the grounds that he was a minor and gave proof of such. Matthew Lawson asked the House to uphold its previous ruling of 13th October 1746. Ruling: The House declared the election of Archibald Alexander null and void and instructed the Deacon to hold a new election	Volume 2, Page 410	February 1755
Gardeners	Gardeners	Robert Moodie the Deacon of the Gardeners gave in a petition mentioning that at a meeting to elect a collector of the Gardeners, two names had been proposed and then some members put forward the name of Arthur Hamilton, who objected that he was not eligible as he was not a Guild Brethren and could neither read nor write. The members then elected Arthur Hamilton. The Deacon asked the House to remedy the situation to enable the craft to have a Collector. Ruling: The House declared the election null and void and instructed the Deacon along with his Masters to make up a new leat with 2 or 3 people who were burgesses and Guild Brothers and could write.	Volume 2, Page 170	November 1731

Gardeners	Gardeners	<p>The Deacon and Masters of the Gardeners gave in a petition outlining that James Ferguson, Gardener burgess had an indenture which indicated that he had served his apprenticeship with William Haltridge, Gardener. James Ferguson had in fact only served a few weeks with William Haltridge and had served the remainder of his time with William Bryce another freeman of the Incorporation, and they had resided outwith the Royalty, the Gardeners now felt that James Ferguson could not become a freeman of the Gardeners and sought the advice of the House. If the House felt that he should be made a freeman then the gardeners who live outwith the royalty and sell their wares in the common market, should be able to become freemen gardeners.</p> <p>Ruling: The House ruled that James Ferguson should be made a member of the Gardeners and that as so much ground previously used for cultivation was now being used for other purposes, Gardeners who lived within one mile of the Regality and who sold their roots and herbs there should be allowed to become members of the Incorporation on paying his dues. These privileges should now be extended to any freeman of any of the other Incorporated Trades.</p>	Volume 2, Page 411	February 1755
Gardeners	Gardeners	<p>James Wilson and John McAulla, both late Deacons of the Gardeners gave in a petition claiming that at the last election of the Collector and Masters, the Deacon had added a name to the leet which had not been agreed by the Masters at a previous meeting and this was against the normal practice of the Incorporation of Gardeners. They asked that the election be found null and void. Ruling: The House ruled that the election was null and void and that a new election should take place in line with the Gardeners rules and traditions.</p>	Volume 2, Page 512	October 1767

Gardeners	Gardeners	Deacon Thomas Barton and Collector William Bryce senior presented a petition to the House which asked that the House ratifies a change to the Gardeners" rules allowing the Deacon to select one person to be Collector, the Masters to select one person and the members to select one person and that these three would make up the leet for the election. It was believed that this would stop the disharmony that had arisen over the years during the election of Collector. Ruling: The House ratified the change to the Gardeners rules.	Volume 2, Page 515	April 1768
Gorbals Weavers	Weavers	John Goudie the Deacon of the Weavers in Glasgow presented a petition concerning the contract between the Gorbals Weavers and themselves where the Gorbals Weavers have to pay them 20/- scots for each loom in Gorbals. The Gorbals Weavers have applied to have the annual payments reduced to 16/- scots. The House was asked to assist in the matter. Ruling: The House appointed a sub-committee to discuss with the Weavers and apply to the magistrates for advice.	Volume 2, Page 215	November 1735
Hammermen	Cordiners	A complaint was presented by the Hammermen against Hugh Andersone, cordiner stating that he had cut leather and made some belts and he should not have done so as beltmakers are appendices of the Hammermen. Hugh admitted his guilt. Ruling: In future Hugh and other members of the Cordiner craft should not make belts or infringe the liberties of the Hammermen and discharged Hugh.	Volume 1, Page 371	February 1661
Hammermen	Cordiners	Hugh Andersone admitted cutting a belt after he had been discharged by the Deacon Convenor for making belts. Ruling: Hugh was fined £10 and escorted to prison by Johne Pattersone the House Officer, where he would reside until the fine was paid.	Volume 1, Page 371	February 1661

Hammermen	Hammermen	Deacon complained that James Leishman miscalling him most shamefully and pressing him on his knees. Ruling: Lieshman was to be set down at the Cross on his knees and his own house and to crave God and the Deacon pardon for his offence.	Volume 1, Page 81,	August 1618
Hammermen	Hammermen	Alexander Jafra the late Deacon of the Hammermen and another Hammerman complained that John Burnes the present Deacon of the Hammermen and a number of others had publicly accused him of stealing five or six or seven pounds of silk which had been stolen from the manufacture of two mortcloths for use by the craft. They had been called common theives and their good names tarnished and James Johnstoune and John Dunkiesoun had offered 40 shillings to prosecute him. The mortcloths were cut up and weighed but the weight matched what it should be so this was kept secret. Ruling: The House found in favour of the complainant and John Burnes and the others who had falsely accused Alexander Jafra were found incapable of holding office until they had given satisfaction to the House and aggrieved parties	Volume 1, Page 353	September 1658
Hammermen	Hammermen	Patrick McIlvicker a Hammerman complained that Alexander Govane the present Deacon of the Hammermen was preventing him from employing a skilled craftsman from London to enable him to improve his Pewter making and had fined him £20. Pewterers were a pendicle of the Hammermen trade and he should be allowed to move from one Hammermen trade to another as was the practice. Ruling: It was ruled after a great deal of thought and discussion that Patrick should be allowed to follow the trade of Pewterer and recommended that the Deacon of the Hammermen should at least weekly, inspect the work and if it was of a poor standard, to remove it and to give it to the poor.	Volume 1, Page 378	May 1662

Hammermen	Hammermen	<p>James Whytlaw, Deacon and William Downie, Collector complained that it has been tradition for longer than anyone can remember that Journeymen and apprentices would work from 6 in the morning until eight at night. A number of journeymen had got together and would only work from six in the morning to seven at night. The Deacon asked the House to ratify their traditional timings. James Colhoun and 30 journeymen petitioned that the work that they did was hard and they only had time to eat their meat when other trades had an hour for breakfast and dinner and stop work at six-o-clock. They did not have time to go to school and if they were allowed to stop at seven they could go to school and their work would be better during the day as they would be cheerier. The Deacon of the Hammermen reported that the apprentices and journeymen in Edinburgh worked from five in the morning to eight at night and that reducing the hours would inevitably raise the price of their goods and they were worried that their servants, instead of using their time for learning, might waste their time gossiping and drinking and making themselves unfit for work the next day. A number of journeymen had formed themselves into a society and elected a Deacon and Masters and making rules and regulations including stopping work at seven-o-clock in the evening. The Deacon of the Hammermen proposed a number of rules to prevent the above occurring and if a Master allowed their servants to stop work at seven in the evening they should be barred from voting or holding office for seven years and be fined £18 scot for the use of the poor. Ruling: The House ratified the act of the Hammermen.</p>	Volume 2, Page 354	November 1748
-----------	-----------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------	---------------

Hammermen	Hammermen	James Glen, Deacon of the Hammermen presented a petition indicating that three saddlers entered into a partnership with 4 merchants to carry on a trade of making and selling saddles and other horse furniture though the merchants were not Hammermen. The Hammermen took the seven to the magistrates who ruled that the magistrates ruled in their favour but the defendants produced a letter of advocacy. The Hammermen asked the House for their advice and support. Ruling: The House approved of the Hammermen's conduct and authorised them to proceed with the utmost vigour.	Volume 2, Page 399	June 1754
Hammermen	Hammermen	A petition was presented by Stephen Maxwell and six Hammermen indicating the at the election of the Collector and Masters, Deacon John Thomson scored his name out from the qualified role and as fourth in the leet for election of Master. When it came to the election of leet position 4, he was elected by a majority of votes (88 votes), but Deacon Thomson refused the result and put David Hendrie (49 votes), saddler in his place. Stephen Maxwell asked the clerk to record two protests, but the clerk indicated that the Deacon had taken the sederunt book and would not allow any entries until he knew their contents. Stephen Tomson then showed the Deacon the two protests and the Deacon accepted one but refused the other. Ruling: The House ruled that the Masters should draw up a leet and the Deacon should ll on the qualified roll should be allowed to vote.	Volume 2, Page 556	October 1773

Hammermen	Non Freeman	<p>The House received a petition from William Lang junior, Deacon of the Hammermen when the petition was handed in on 30th June 1767 and Robert Miller, then Collector. The petition indicated that Archibald Bogle and John Edmonston, both merchants in Glasgow and Charles Colquhoun coach or chaisemaker had entered into a partnership for making coaches and chaises and other machines and working all of the iron work without being a freeman of the Hammermen. They also refused to make an essay or join the Incorporation and pay the ordinary dues. The Hammermen sought the advice of the House.</p> <p>Ruling: The House unanimously directed the Hammermen to pursue the case before the magistrates or any other court for a fine and damages and that they would be stopped working in iron until they joined the Incorporation.</p>	Volume 2, Page 521	October 1768
Hammermen	Tailors	<p>Alexander Jafra the Deacon of the Hammermen complained that Gilbert Moresoune of the Tailors was manufacturing and importing saddles and this was part of the Hammermen craft. Gilbert Moresoune admitted his error and claimed he was a stranger, lately come to the burgh and unaware of this ruling.</p> <p>Ruling: The Tailors were instructed not to carry out any saddler work and if they did they would be fined £20 and that Gilbert Moresoune should pay £20 to the Hammermen.</p>	Volume 1, Page 338	November 1656

Hammermen and Cordiners	Merchants and Saddlers	A letter was sent to the House from William Bogle, James Douglass junior, Thomas Peter, James Dunlop and Robert Marshall all partners in the new saddle and shoe factory in Glasgow indicating that each partner would pay the freedom fines of the respective trades and their servants would become liable for the same dues and regulations. As the partners were not practical men in the business they asked that they be allowed not to sit an essay as their foremen would do so and be in charge of the workmanship of the factory. The Deacons suggested that the foremen would sit the essay and be entered as a freeman of the respective trade. The Deacons of the Hammermen and the Cordiners had convened meetings of their trades and they had agreed to this. Ruling: The House, by a majority ratified and approved the Deacons' decision.	Volume 2, Page 424	March 1757
Hammermen and Cordiners	Merchants and Saddlers	The Deacon Convener reported that he had received a letter from James Dunlop indicating that the partners were willing to become members of the Incorporations and pay their dues etc., but he was not willing to agree to his foremen having to become members. They would sit the essay, but not become members. Ruling: The House recommended to the Hammermen and Cordiners to accept the partners as freemen and not onlge the foremen to be entered as freemen.	Volume 2, Page 425	March 1757
Hammermen and Cordiners	Merchants and Saddlers	James Lindsay Deacon of the Hammermen and John Forsyth Deacon of the Cordiners petitioned the House concerning several actions pursued before the Lords of Council and Session by the Hammermen and Cordiners against James Dunlop junior and others merchants and three saddlers for making and selling saddlery, boots and shoes without being freemen Hammermen or Cordiners. The Lords of Council and Session found in favour of the interlocutors and the Hammermen and Cordiners sought the Houses' agreement and support in appealing to the House of Lords. Ruling: The House agreed to pay 1/3 of the costs with the Hammermen paying 1/3 and the Cordiners 1/3. The Deacon	Volume 2, Page 423	February 1757

		Convener and Baillie Robert Finlay agreed to go to London and plead their case.		
Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners and Maltmen	Trades House	The Deacons of the Hammermen, Tailors, Cordiners and Maltmen exhibited and put into the hands of John Wardrop, Clerk to the House, letters of suspension against the Deacon Convener and the Deacons of the Incorporations of Weavers, Bakers, Skinners, Wrights, Coopers, Fleshers, Masons, Gardeners, Barbers and Bonnetmakers & Dyers dated 11th September 1771 concerning an act of the Trades House dated 12th June 1771 for continuing the trades baillie a member of the House after expiry of his office. (See page 535 of Lumsden, Volume 2). And the petition presented by the other 10 Deacons to have equal representation in the House. The suspension was read to the House so that they could not deny knowledge of it and therefore could not implement the equal representation of members without the risk of legal proceedings against them.	Volume 2, Page 539	September 1771
Letter of Guildry	All Crafts	All burgesses wives within the burgh shall have for the present enjoy such privileges and liberties during the time of their widowhood as if their husbands were alive in the benefits of the guildry paying to the Dean of Guild 13 shillings and 4 pennies and 3 shillings 4 pennies to the hospital of his choosing. The said widows being tried by the Dean of Guild and his council to be of good and honest conversation and the widows to come shall have the same liberty if their husbands have been guild brethren otherwise not to enjoy that profit and benefit.	Volume 1, Page 541	9 February 1695

Maltmen	Gardeners	Visitor of the Maltmen Andrew Thomson and Robert Stevenson, Collector of the Maltmen presented a petition that Robert Tennant, a Gardiner had made or paid others to make beer without him being a member of the Maltmen. The Maltmen had fined Robert Tennant 20 merks and banned him from malting until he had entered and paid the dues to become a Maltman. On being fined, Robert Tennant had approached the Court of Session and had a hold put on their act banning him from Malting. The Maltmen asked the House to guide them and to offer what support that they could. Ruling: The House offered all reasonable assistance in money or otherwise and encouraged them to fight the case to the end.	Volume 2, Page 335	September 1746
Maltmen	Gardeners	James Miller, Visitor and Patrick Reid senior, Collector presented a petition relating to a petition of the Maltmen in 1745 regarding Robert Tennant, Gardener had been stopped from brewing beer and ale for his personal use. The magistrates fined him 20 merks for use of the poor and discharged him from brewing until he became a member of the Maltmen. Robert Tennant then had his suspension lifted by the Lords of Council and Session as he did not make malt for sale and therefore was not obliged to enter the Maltmen Incorporation. Ruling: the House supported the Maltmen in their defence of their rights	Volume 2, Page 368	December 1749
Maltmen	Gardeners	The Visitor of the Maltmen met with the House and there was a vote on whether the House would support the Maltmen in appealing to the Lords of Council in the case between them and Robert Tennant, Gardener. Ruling: 90 voted for non-submission and 2 voted that the case should be submitted to the Court of Session.	Volume 2, Page 370	February 1750

Maltmen	Maltmen	The Visitor of the Maltmen complained that Peter Corbet and Robert Robiesone (Maltmen) said that they would not enrol their apprentices with the Maltmem. They also used unsavoury comments about the Maltmen and their Craft. Ruling: They were fined 20 merks which had to be payed to the Collector and 40 shillings scots to be paid to the Baillies and that they should be imprisoned until they pay their fines. They were also to give satisfaction to the Deacon Convenor, Deacons, Visitor of the Maltmen and Masters of the Maltmen and that neither should be able to vote or be voted in until he pays the 4000 marks.	Volume 1, Page 510	April 1677
Maltmen	Maltmen	John Hamilton, the Visitor of the Maltmen asked that the ruling that quarter accounts had to be paid before Lambas court each year should be dispensed with as it was inconvenient to the Maltmen. Ruling: The House accepted the Maltmens case and ruled that they could pay their debts by 1st December and be allowed to vote and be leated in elections etc.	Volume 2, Page 309	June 1744
Maltmen	Maltmen	The Visitors and Masters of the Maltmen complained that John Stevenson had been elected Collector but refused to accept the office. An Act of the House on 29th November 1743 stipulated that non-acceptance unless under specified conditions would incur a fine of £6 sterling and they asked that John Stevenson be fined and the Maltmen instructed to carry out another election for a Collector. John Stevenson had sent a letter to the Deacon Convener indicating that his health was poor and would not be able to carry out the duties of Collector adequately and had enclosed £6 sterling in payment of the fine. Ruling: The House found that John Stevenson had refused to accept office and accepted his £6 as the fine which was passed to the Visitor for the use of the poor. The Convener ruled that John Stevenson should not be obliged to take any office in the Incorporation unless he felt fit to do so.	Volume 2, Page 459	December 1760
Maltmen	Trades House	The Maltmen purchased the two House mortcloths for the sum of £41 at an auction.	Volume 1, Page 327	November 1655

Masons	Barbers	There was a dispute raised as to the seniority of the Masons and the Barbers.	Volume 2, Page 88	October 1723
Masons	Barbers	The House met to consider the claim that the barbers should be ranked higher than the Masons. Ruling: the House ruled that prior to the split with the Surgeons, the Barbers were placed between the Bonnetmakers and the Gardeners and that the Barbers should in all time coming be so ranked. Alexander Milne, the Deacon of the Barbers informed the House that he intended to appeal to the Town Council.	Volume 2, Page 89	January 1724
Masons	Masons	Late Deacon William Kerr besieged the House to allow Hugh Kerr the lawful son of George Kerr of Bogeside in Auchans of Dundonald to be booked by the Craft as a Mason Apprentice from 1721. The Deacon of the Masons at the time of Hugh Kerr's indenture had refused to book him as an apprentice. Ruling: Having heard the evidence it was ruled that the indentures were collusive and artfully contrived and that the Mason Craft were right in not booking Hugh Kerr.	Volume 2, Page 80	April 1723
Masons	Masons	Deacon William Paull of the Masons presented a petition asking the House to ratify an act of the Masons which clarified that the Deacon could only be elected for one year and not be able to continue a second year. Ruling: The House ratified the act of the Masons,	Volume 2, Page 519	September 1768
Masons	Masons	A petition was presented by William Horn, mason and Daniel Wardrop, late Deacon of the masons complaining that William Horn had been struck off the qualified roll of the Masons when he had paid his journeymen's dues of 2/- each and as he had 10 journeymen, he had paid the Collector 20/-. In his absence it was voted that he should be struck off the roll as he was not present to confirm the number of journeymen that he employed. He asked the House for redress. Ruling: The House ruled that William Horn should be added to the Masons qualified roll and be allowed to vote in elections.	Volume 2, Page 566	September 1775

Masons	Slaters	The Deacon of the Masons appealed to the House to ensure that any non-freemen in the burgh who carry outslating should become freemen or work for a freeman.	Volume 1, Page 403	May 1665
Masons	Wrights	Masons complaining that the Wrights had filled a void (possibly an old doorway) and carried out slating on a roof. Ruling: Wrights told to desist	Volume 1, Page 27	June 1610
Merchant	Wrights	Robert Ewing, merchant asked the House to instruct the Wrights to allow him to become a member as he was married to Isobell Barton, the daughter of Walter Barton, a freeman of the Wrights. He had applied several times to the Wrights but had always been refused. Ruling: The House ordained that at the next meeting of the Wrights, they should admit Robert Ewing without an essay upon paying his dues and renouncing all freedom privileges to any children of his body except the children between him and Isobell Barton.	Volume 2, Page 381	September 1751
Skinners	Hammermen	Manasses Lyll, Deacon of the Skinners complained that Johne Liper, Hammerman, of doing the work of the Skinners. Ruling: John Liper was instructed to stop doing the Skinners work under pain of £10.	Volume 1, Page 177	February 1636
Skinners	Skinners	George Clerk the late Deacon of the Skinners complained that James Padie present Deacon of the Skinners and John Caldwell and others opened the Skinners Box, without the Deacon being present. Androw Love and William Govane also admitted being present and involved. Four bands had been taken away and are now missing. Ruling: The four: James Padie, John Caldwell, Androw Love and William Govane shall not hold office in the Skinners until the four bands are returned. They should also give satisfaction to the House and each pay a fine of 5 dollars for the poor.	Volume 1, Page 344	August 1657

Skinner	Skinner	George Clerk the late Deacon of the Skinners complained that James Padie, the present Deacon of the Skinners and William Govane, Skinner who had previously been defenders and had been censored by the Deacon Convenor for opening the Craft Box and that four bands were missing from the Box and that James Padie in the presence of others had falsley claimed that he had opened the Box and taken the bands and that William Govane had seen him do so. James Padie had said these things on numerous occasions in front of others and had damaged his good name. James Clerk produced two famous witnesses for his defence. Ruling: The House found the accused guilty and fined them 10 dollars and to remain in ward until the payment is made. The accused had also to give satisfaction to George Clerk and the House for the wrong that they had done.	Volume 1, Page 345	August 1657
Skinner	Skinner	As a follow up to James Padie's misbehaviour, he freely allowed his servant [] Reid to join another master to complete his years of apprenticeship.	Volume 1, Page 347	August 1657
Skinner	Skinner	John Auldcorn and Robert Bogill, Skinners, complained that Mannas Lyle, George Clerk and William Govane, Skinners, were making bargains with the fleshers to buy their skins so that the remaining skinners nad the poor could not purchase skins. This was causing suffering and hurt and also broke a statute of the burgh. Ruling: The case was remitted to the Provost Bailies Council for their sentence.	Volume 1, Page 387	September 1663
Skinner	Skinner	The Deacon and several members of the Skinners complained that Walter and John Jamiesons for their refusal to obey an act of the Skinners regarding the cableing sheep and lamb skins. Ruling: The House appointed a sub-committee to look into the matter.	Volume 2, Page 174	May 1732

Skinner	Skinner	John Jamieson Deacon of the Skinners complained that 2 apprentices, John and James Barclays, that had entered the craft as freemen <i>gratis</i> , had not served a year as Officer to the craft as had been the custom for over 40 years. Neither had they paid any gratuity in lieu of service and were therefore debtors to the craft. At the election of the Deacon both had voted for Thomas Peadie. 14 honest freemen had voted for John Wilson and 15 for Thomas Peadie. An appeal was therefore made to the House that John and James Barclays' votes should not count towards Thomas Peadie and that John Wilson should be Deacon. Ruling: As nom prove of debt by John and James Barclays had been produced, the election of Thomas Peadie as Deacon stood.	Volume 2, Page 250	October 1738
Skinner	Skinner	Hugh Bryson and Alexander Paterson, Master Skinners, complained that an act of 18th May 1711 that prevented the purchase of more than 100 green sheep skins or more than 100 green lamb skins at once under the penalty of £5 scots for each transgression and that if a Skinner buys from a Fleshers more than 12 green sheep or lamb skins, any freeman could apply to purchase a share of the skins on paying ready money and failure to share would result in a fine of £5 scots. It was stated that the present Deacon John Jamieson, Rob Shearer the Collector and 7 other members of the Skinners and at least one, Jean Park had for at least six years been buying green skins above the number specified and making a monopoly of the skins and not selling shares to other freemen. John Jamieson replied stating that the act was contrary to the law and liberty of the subject and hurtful to him and several others as restraining them from the full and free exercise of their business. Ruling: The House upheld the act of the Skinners as it appeared that the act was for the benefit and utility of all its members.	Volume 2, Page 408	January 1755
Skinner	Weaver in Gorbals	Late Deacon John Jamieson of the Skinners complained that the present Deacon John Wilson had improperly accepted John	Volume 2, Page 398	March 1754

		Henderson, weaver in Gorbals as a member of the Skinners on the grounds that he was the son of William Jack a freeman of the Skinners, by marrying Margaret Jack, daughter of William Jack. Margaret Jack was dead before he applied to become a member of the Skinners. The House had on the 18th January approved the enrolment of John Henderson but had declared that bthe appeal should come before the House. Ruling: The House heard the appeal and ruled that John Henderson should not be booked as a freeman of the Skinners and his admission money should be returned to him.		
Tailors	Bakers	James Briscatt (Tailor) and William Herriot (Baker), were both taken off the leets to be Deacon and Masters of their Crafts for one year.	Volume 1, Page 82	September 1618
Tailors	Tailors	Thomas Gray, Deacon of the Tailors complained about John Dalrimpill, (Tailor) for misusing and calling him. Ruling: John Dalrimpil was fined £10 to the weill of the poor, his booth window to be boarded up and a further fine of £10. As a further punishment he had to set down at the Market Cross on his knees and to crave God, the Deacon and the whole Craft pardon and he was not to have his freedom until he had done so.	Volume 1, Page 82	May 1619
Tailors	Trades House	David Biskett appealed against being not allowed to vote in elections or bear any office for the next five years. Ruling: David Biskett's appeal was upheld.	Volume 2, Page 38	February 1777
Tailors	Tailors	Cornelius Luke the Deacon of the Tailors complained that many people had been guilty of questioning lawful authority, raising strife and sedition among the craft and should be severely punished. David Biskett was named as one of the people who had participated in one or more of the crimes. David Biskett had railed against him and said that " <i>he was a Deacon illegally chosen and no Deacon and that he had chosen as great a Jacobite in Glasgow to be one of his Masters and that he was a great Jacobite himself.</i> " David Biskett was accused of saying such things and worse at various public meetings. Ruling: The	Volume 2, Page 35	May 1716

		House found the accusation proven and ruled that David Biskett should hold no office in the Tailor Craft for five years and would convene at another meeting of the House to rule on any further punishment.		
Tailors	Tailors	John Minto and Cornelius Luke presented a petition to the House concerning the ruling that no person was allowed to vote for the position of Deacon if they owed money to the trade. At the Tailors election not one person who voted for John Minto owed even a farthing whilst eleven members who voted for Gabriel Corsbie owed money to the trade. The result of the election was 74 votes to Gabriel Corsbie and 71 to John Minto. Therefore John Minto should have been declared Deacon. Ruling: It was declared that John Minto be Deacon of the Tailors.	Volume 2, Page 97	September 1724
Tailors	Tailors	A petition was presented to the House by John Minto, Cornelius Luke and James Steven saying that when they met to elect a Deacon, John Minto as the present Deacon was not allowed to have his normal vote as Deacon and casting vote in case of a tie. Gabriell Corsbie has 89 votes and Cornelius Luke had 88 and that the Deacon would have given him his vote and casting vote also. Ruling: The House ruled that John Minto should have his normal vote and casting vote and therefore Cornelius Luke was the elected Deacon.	Volume 2, Page 100	September 1725
Tailors	Tailors	None of the Tailor trade were listed in the minutes of the Trades House in October 1733 as they had not elected a Deacon for that year. Ruling: as John Millar was the last Deacon of the Tailors, tradition has it that he will serve on the House and therefore he will be leated as a Lyner for that year.	Volume 2, Page 194	October 1733
Tailors	Tailors	John Millar the last Deacon of the Tailors petitioned the House concerning the election of a new Deacon of the Tailors. Ruling: The House ruled that there should be a new election and John Millar should convene this meeting prior to 15th November and pay their debts to the trade. A meeting of the whole craft eligible to vote should be called for the 23rd November at 3pm in the	Volume 2, Page 194	November 1733

		Trades Hospital and vote for a new Deacon. A list of freemen that are eligible to vote should be in the Convenors' hands on the 15th November.		
Tailors	Tailors	James Buchanan elder had been elected Collector and refused to accept the position. Ruling: As James Buchanan was acting as Treasurer to the Town Council, he should be free from taking office. The Deacon was instructed to reconvene and elect a new Collector. It was also ruled that anyone who had been made Treasurer of the Town Council or Collector of the House would not have to accept election to Collector of any trade and all others would be obliged to pay a fine of £6 sterling for the use of the poor of the trade.	Volume 2, Page 305	November 1743
Tailors	Tailors	John McKinlay, tailor protested to the House that he had been debarred from voting in an election of the Tailors on the pretext that he owed them 20 merks scots because he had taken two apprentices within five years, even though he did not. John Bore had been an apprentice bound to him but his indentures were cancelled and destroyed and he was later on a Journeyman. He had Robert Inglis as his only apprentice. He asked that the House find that he was not a debtor and that he should have the full privileges and rights of the trade. Ruling: The House found that John McKinlay did not have two apprentices within five years and was therefore not a debtor and should be restored to the rights and privileges of his trade.	Volume 2, Page 352	September 1748
Tailors	Tailors	Deacon Robert Anderson and Collectot Archibald McEwing presented a petition asking the House for support in a case to be heard before the Lords of Council and Session on the 12th and 19th June 1760, which had been taken out by Robert Whyte, a freeman tailor who had rejected the byelaws of the Incorporation. Ruling: The House advised and directed the Tailors to defend their byelaws by all legal methods and indicated that they would at all times be willing to give advice and reasonable assistance where necessary.	Volume 2, Page 450	April 1760

Tailors	Tailors	Archibald McQueen and several Tailors complained about the undue and illegal methods used to elect the last Officer of the Tailors. Ruling: The House found that the election of John Wallace was precipitately and unwarrantably proceeded in and declared the election null and void. The House ordained that the Deacon John Couper had to convene another election for the election of the Officer of the Tailors.	Volume 2, Page 536	June 1771
Tailors	Tailors	A complaint had been made by Deacon Alexander Farquhar of the Tailors that at a meeting of the Tailors, two Masters John Miller and George Blair had insulted and maltreated him and threatened to turn him out of his chair. A committee had been appointed to gather evidence and report back to the House. Ruling: The House voted on whether the culprits should be classed or rebooked and by the Deacon Convener's vote, they agreed to class them. A second vote was then put concerning the length of time that they should be classed: either one year; two years or three years. By a majority of votes it was agreed to class them for one year. Therefore John Miller and George Blair could not bear any office or vote in the Tailors for one year.	Volume 2, Page 550	December 1772
Trades House	All Crafts	Due to the number of disputes over the election of Deacons and Masters, the House made the following ruling. Ruling: Every Deacon and Visitor should hold his Lammas Court sometime in August, warn all freemen and they have to pay their quarterly dues at the meeting or have no vote in any affair of the trade or be eligible for election to any office in the trade. All elections of Masters, Collectors, clerks and officers must be before the 1st day of November.	Volume 2, Page 198	May 1734
Trades House	All Crafts	The House ordained that in future at House meetings the Deacons should direct their remarks to the Deacon Convenor only and no one should speak to another or interrupt another when they were speaking to the Deacon Convenor.	Volume 2, Page 294	November 1742

Trades House	Bakers	The Deacon Convener and Walter Lang and others presented a petition claiming that the Bakers Deacon John Craig had connived to ensure that Masters who were opposed to his view of who should receive James Muirhead's Mortification were out of time when it came to vote for it. He also allowed 2 Box Masters to vote, who were not eligible. He secured the mortification for Robert Ainslie who was a little over 40 years old and had no wife or family and could earn 3/- sterling weekly as opposed to Patrick Lang, who had a wife and several children. Ruling: The House found that the election of Robert Ainslie to the poor man on the mortification to be irregular and that a new meeting should be convened and all warned well in advance.	Volume 2. Page 475	April 1763
Trades House	Bakers	Andrew Duncan and 4 other Bakers presented a petition asking that the House rescinds its last order to hold an election on James Muirhead's mortification as the money should be put to new apprentices wages and that there should be no new person on the mortification until a year has passed from the last vacancy. Ruling: The House ruled that James Muirhead had made a second mortification which covered the wages of the apprentices and he had revoked the year's clause. The Deacon was instructed to hold an election for the mortification. John Craig immediately protested and took the case to law.	Volume 2, Page 476	April 1763
Trades House	Bakers	Deacon John Craig produced an extract of James Muirhead's mortification which made it clear that there should be no new recipient until a year after the death of the last recipient. Ruling: The House ruled that the Bakers should hold a meeting and vote in a new recipient to take effect a year after the death of the last.	Volume 2, Page 478	April 1763
Trades House	Bakers	At a meeting of the patrons of Deacon James Muirhead's Mortifications to the Baker trade, ordained that Patrick Lang would be the new recipient of the mortification from Lambass.	Volume 2, Page 478	July 1763

Trades House	Bakers	The House ordained that Patrick Lang should have a vote at elections within the Incorporation of Bakers even though he was enjoying the benefits of James Muirhead's mortification.	Volume 2, Page 481	September 1763
Trades House	Cordiners	It was reported to the House that John Finlay, Cordiner, at a public meeting of the Cordiners had several times cursed and swore at the meeting and called the Deacon Convener Daniell Munro, " <i>a damned bitch, bougor</i> " and called him many bad names and threatened him. The House was of the opinion that John Finlay brought to justice in front of the magistrate so that he might be fined and imprisoned.	Volume 2, Page 465	September 1761
Trades House	Hammermen	The Deacon of the Hammermen had wrongly made a freeman of his craft . Ruling: Deacon was fined.	Volume 1, Page 75,	November 1616
Weavers	Deacon Convener	It was proven that Patrick Clark, the late Deacon of the Weavers had said that Manasses Lyle was not worthy to bear the office of Deacon Convener. Ruling: Patrick Clark was fined £40 and to remain in ward until the sum was payed and he apologised to Manasses Lyle for his wrong doing. Patrick Clark was also banned from holding office in his craft in future.	Volume 1, Page 323	October 1655
Weavers	Gorbals Weavers	The Deacon of the Weavers complained at the number of Gorbals Weavers and the likelihood that the Glasgow Weavers would be " <i>turned to beggars</i> ". Ruling: George Broune, James Elphistoun, John Hall and Robert Wilsoune were appointed to meet with the Deacon of the Weavers and bring a solution to the House.	Volume 1, Page 298	February 1652
Weavers	Trades House	Patrick McCumming, Deacon of the Weavers asked the House for support in reversing an act of Parliament which would allow anyone to set themselves up as weavers without being a member of the Incorporation. Ruling: The House agreed to ask the Glasgow members of Parliament to oppose the bill.	Volume 2, Page 395	December 1753

Weavers	Trades House	Alexander Riddell Deacon of the Weavers petitioned the House to support the Weavers by trying to have the law altered that allowed anyone to set up as a weaver in Glasgow. This law was making many of the Weavers poor men and attracting to the city men who were unskilled and would fail and become poor and a burden on the charity of the city. The quality of workmanship by these incomers was very low and brining bad repute to Glasgow. Ruling: The House agreed to approach the magistrates and town council for their advice and assistance to obtain redress of the grievance.	Volume 2, Page 461	June 1761
Weavers	Weavers	Members of the Weavers complained about John Clark, weaver for using sedition and trying to undermine the election so that he would become deacon. Ruling: John Clark was not allowed to be put forward for election and to suspend him for one year.	Volume 1, Page 76,	October 1616
Weavers	Weavers	George Schirilaw complained that John Clark miscalled him mainsourne and that he also strived to be Deacon. Ruling: As both had called others names and were troublesome people to the Craft, they were to be taken off the leet to be Deacon and Masters of the Craft for a year.	Volume 1, Page 82	September 1618
Weavers	Weavers	Ar[.....]d Paterson and a number of his colleagues in the Weavers complained about Johne Clark and his Masters of the Weavers for taking £50 out of the Box which was intended for the common good. Ruling: Johne Clark had to pay £10 and each of his named Masters had to pay a fine also. They also had to return the £50 or be put out of the Craft.	Volume 1, Page 107	December 1623

Weavers	Weavers	Patrik Clerk, the Deacon of the Weavers complained that John Clerk, his brother, John Finlay and John Kirlie, that when he was in the home of William Flemyngis with other honest men and "having no evil in his mind", John Kirlie came to him and asked what he had to do with Niell Steinstoun and having answered him truly, John Kirlie said that "he was nothing but a whore son and his sleeve". John Kirlie then ruffled his beard, punched him with his feat, abused his wife and bloodied his hand. Many more nasty comments were made by John Kirlie and the others. Ruling: John Kirlie was banned from holding the office of Deacon and was fined £20. The others were fined £3 and banned from voting in Craft elections for three years.	Volume 1, Page 115	March 1626
Weavers	Weavers	Patrik Clerk and James Wingzit were accused of misbehaving greatly in front of Johne Falconer their present Deacon by calling him names and James Wingzit threw a full cup of ale at Patrik Clerk. Ruling: Each was fined £4 for the use of the poor and they were warned that if they misbehaved again they would be banned from ever holding any office in the Craft.	Volume 1, Page 148	December 1630
Weavers	Weavers	Johne Patersonne the Deacon of the Weavers petitioned due to the great want of work among his brethren due to the large number of strangers who were becoming freemen with the Weavers due to the small freedom fine on joining. The Weavers had enacted that all new Far Hand members would pay £80 and asked that the House ratifies this decision. Ruling: The act was ratified.	Volume 1, Page 472	May 1673
Weavers	Weavers	A complaint and petition was made by James Mitchell weaver indicating that he had taken on an indentured apprentice Thomas Burnside the lawful son of Robert Burnside an indweller in Glasgow and dated 9th April 1725. One of the items in the indenture stated that if Thomas was absent then his father would pay 6/8d for each day of his absence. During his time with James Mitchell, the apprentice absented himself for 40 days and even when he was present his work was often below standard	Volume 2, Page 125	January 1727

		and that he (James Mitchell) had given him a slap or two with is loof on his shoulders. The apprentice then applied to Robert Wood the Deacon of the Weavers, saying that he had been beaten by his master and wished to be released from his service and to be an apprentice to another. The Deacon and Masters agreed to this and ruled that the present Master could not take on another apprentice. All this was done without proof. Ruling: The House ruled that as there was no proof then the previous arrangements should stand.		
Weavers	Weavers	John Watsonne younger weaver complained that some weavers were taking stranger journeymen weavers from the country without making his serve 2 years for has his profit as is the rule in the Weaver Craft. Ruling: The House ruled it reasonable that any freeman weaver should be able to employ a journeyman that he thinks fit without distinction of where he comes from and for whatever wages they can agree on. This to be the practice of the Weavers in future and former acts to the contrary should be rescinded.	Volume 2, Page 172	March 1732
Wrights	Flesher	The Deacon of the Fleshers refused to pay certain fees and insulted the Deacon of the Wrights. Ruling: Deacon of Fleshers fined £10.	Volume 1, Page 70,	May 1616
Wrights	Some Members of Master Court	Some dodgy voting took place and the Deacon and Masters disputed the election. Ruling: The result was reversed and a new Deacon elected	Volume 1, Page 49, December 1613	December 1613
Wrights	Wrights	The Deacon presented a leet for the position of Masters and omitted to place James Elphistoune on it which resulted in most of the members walking out and refusing to vote. The Deacon reported that James Elphistoune had declared at his admission that he would have nothing to do with them and cast down his shilling starling as his years' payment; he had left the meeting and had not attended any other meeting. The Deacon also commented that he had not sworn his oath and therefore was not eligible to vote. The Deacon Convenor checked with the others	Volume 1, Page 322	September 1655

		on the leet and found that four had not or could not remember swearing their oath. Ruling: Only the two who had sworn should be put forward on the leet to become Deacons.		
Wrights	Wrights	A number of Wrights " <i>for their own pernicious ends</i> ", had asked other Wrights to sign a paper which were seditious and would cause trouble amongst the members of the Wrights and that the comments were aimed at their Deacon Alexander Eglington. Ruling: Each of the named Wrights was fined 2 dollars for the use of the poor.	Volume 1, Page 401	May 1665
Wrights	Wrights	Alexander Eglington, Deacon of the Wrights had fined George Drew, Wright, a new membership of 20 marks for for abusing Alexander Daniell the late Deacon of the Wrights. Ruling: George Drew was instructed to pay 20 marks to cover the membership of William Reid son of David Reid and to give satisfaction to Alexander Daniel and also that George Drew should not have any votes in his Craft or hold any office or charge in the House for all time coming.	Volume 1, Page 420	May 1667
Wrights	Wrights	Alexander Danziell the Deacon of the Wrights complained that Robert Dickie one of nthe Wrights had called him and other honest Wrights " <i>But pendicles</i> " with several other railings, vilifying and threatening expressions. Robert Dickie also said " <i>most malicious utter the same</i> " and made it clear that he thought that the Deacon Convenor and the House had no authority in the matter. Robert Dickie had been fined and imprisoned three years previously for a similar offence. Ruling: Robert Dickie was fined 20 marks and not allowed to hold office, have a vote in elections and if he miscalls anyone on the Trade, he would be fined £5 for the use of the poor and 40 shillings to the Baillies.	Volume 1, Page 471	March 1673

Wrights	Wrights	Alexander Danizell late Deacon of the Wrights in place of the deceased Alexander Egleintoun Deacon, complained that Johne Coorse had several times abused him with unhansome expressions not fit to be repeated. Ruling: Johne Corse was fined £10 for his several faults and declared incapable of holding any office in the Trade for three years and that he should have no vote or voted in for that period.	Volume 1, Page 482	June 1674
Wrights	Wrights	The Deacon of the Wrights, Archibald Buchanan complained that his Masters had, contrary to his remonstrance's, enrolled among their quarterly poor Margaret Morton widow of [] Drew, wright but is now the widow of Robert Will, quarrier which was against the rules of the Wrights. Ruling: The House found that the enrolment of Margaret Morton was irregular but felt that she should receive the two last payments of Candlemas and Beltan but receive no further quarterly money. She should only receive charity from the society among other common persons.	Volume 2, Page 491	July 1765
Wrights	Wrights	The Deacon of the Wrights presented a petition asking the House to approve an act of the Wrights which would prevent freemen Wrights working with un freemen or claiming work done by unfreemen as their own or paying unfreemen journeymen higher wages than agreed by the Wrights. Failure to comply would be punishable by having to pay a new membership of the Wrights and lose his privileges until it is paid.	Volume 2, Page 522	April 1769

Wrights	Wrights	A petition in the name of the Incorporation of Wrights was presented which indicated that to be placed on the qualified roll, members must have cleared their debts to the Incorporation by Lambass and that in August each year the leets for offices were to be made up and no changes to be made after that time. On 15th September the Deacons and Masters voted on whether John Craig should be added to the qualified role, even though he was in arrears of mortcloths. He also owed booking money for a journeyman. A vote was taken that John Craig was not a debtor and was therefore added to the qualified roll. Ruling: The House, after hearing evidence from the Deacon and others and examining the minute book decided that John Craig should be struck from the qualified roll and not be able to vote in the ensuing election.	Volume 2, Page 567	September 1776
Wrights in Gorbals	Wrights	A petition was presented by John Muirhead, oversman of the Wrights in the Gorbals asking that he and others might be made freemen in the Incorporation of Wrights in Glasgow. Ruling: the House decided that it was not able to rule on the matter and it was for the Wrights in Glasgow to decide.	Volume 2, Page 265	May 1740