

THE SCOTTISH GENEALOGIST

Quarterly Journal of the SCOTTISH GENEALOGY SOCIETY

Contents	Page
Circular from General Register Office for Scotland	77
Points of View	78
The Industrial Associates of the Cadell Family in the Eighteenth Century	82
Queries	90
Book Review	92
Register of Research	94

BY ITS CONSTITUTION, the Scottish Genealogy Society exists "to promote research into Scottish Family History", and "to undertake the collection, exchange and publication of information and material relating to Scottish Genealogy by means of meetings, lectures, etc." By the expressed desire of the original members, the Society was to remain an academic and consultative body, and was not to engage itself professionally in record searching. Arrangements will be made by which the Society can supply a list of those members who are professional searchers, but any commissions of this kind must be carried out independently of the Society.

Monthly meetings of the Society are held from September to April in The Royal College of Physicians, 9 Queen Street, Edinburgh, at 7 p.m. around the 15th of the month. In the event of the 15th falling on Saturday or Sunday, the meeting is held on the following Monday.

Membership of the Scottish Genealogy Society is by election at an annual subscription of £2.50 (\$7) inclusive of The Scottish Genealogist. This subscription, which is payable on 1st October, entitles members to receive the Magazine during the following 12 months. Inquiries may be made to the Hon. Secretary, 21 Howard Place, Edinburgh, and subscriptions paid to the Hon. Treasurer, 20 Ravelston Garden, Edinburgh.

The Scottish Genealogist will be published quarterly. Subscription is £2 (\$6) per annum (post free). Single copies are available from the Hon. Editor at 50p (\$1.50) post free.

All material for publication must be sent to the Hon. Editor, c/o Messrs Shepherd & Wedderburn, W.S., 16 Charlotte Square, Edinburgh, 2, in a form ready for immediate use. MSS must be fully referenced, signed and previously unpublished.

Publication in The Scottish Genealogist does not imply that all views therein are accepted or admitted by The Scottish Genealogy Society. Authors, and not the Society, are responsible for errors of fact.

All communications submitted should be accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope (or other means of return). Published matter will not be returned; but will become the property of the Society.

Reproduction from The Scottish Genealogist, in part or in whole, may not be made without permission.

CIRCULAR from

GENERAL REGISTER OFFICE FOR SCOTLAND

OPRs AND OPEN CENSUS RECORDS—CHANGES IN FACILITIES FOR ACCESS

In October 1976, major changes will take place in the facilities in New Register House for producing the Old Parochial Registers (OPRs) and Open Census Records (1841-91) to the public. Microfilm will gradually be introduced in place of the original registers.

The reason for the change-over is the growing deterioration in the condition of the records, arising not only from their increasing age but from the ever-expanding demand for access to them. Since 1955 the number of searchers has risen tenfold and continues to rise. The consequent increase in wear-and-tear on the bindings and fragile record pages has made their maintenance in good repair a difficult and expensive task.

A high quality, silver-based negative microfilm copy of the records will be prepared on 35 mm rolls, from which will be derived the working copies required for staff and public use. When the working copies give out, fresh copies will be taken from the master negative. Thus it should not be necessary to have recourse to the original registers, except to elucidate doubtful readings on the film.

The actual filming will be carried out in New Register House by the Mormon Genealogical Society, who wish to acquire a new set of OPR films because of defects in the film series prepared by them in the early 1950s. They have also agreed to refilm the Open Census Records where defects in the existing films clearly make this desirable. As on the previous occasion, the Society will present the department with a free copy derived from their own master negative. Thereafter the Society intend to compile a computer-based index to the Baptismal and Marriage entries in the OPRs—some 20 million all told. A copy of the index will then be offered to the department at a fraction of the actual cost of compiling the index. The advantage to the department of acquiring a master film and an index, both at a substantial saving to public funds, cannot be over emphasised.

In order to facilitate the conversion to microfilm, and to reduce the annual cost, the project is expected to last for 6-7 years. 500-600 OPR volumes will be withdrawn for filming each year. Prior to filming they will be broken down into individual folios by HMSO Binding Section at Sighthill, to ensure that all data may be captured by the camera. *The volumes to be withdrawn in the first year are those for parishes nos. 1-177 inclusive.*

During the interim period until the new films come to hand, the old films prepared in the 1950s will be the only means of consulting the records. Unfortunately, the quality of these films is variable, partly because of their age; partly because of the inexperience of the camera operators in dealing with such intractable material as the OPRs; and partly because of the tight binding of a large proportion of the registers, which meant that the camera was unable to capture vital information at the innermost margins. Nevertheless, they are the

only substitute available and every effort will be made to ensure that this interim period is as brief as possible. If things go smoothly it should not exceed 4-5 months each year.

In the early years of the project, only a proportion of the Search Room places will be equipped with microfilm readers, but as more and more films come into use, the number of readers will be increased until every seat has one. The reading equipment selected is the Carl Zeiss Dokumator DL2, which is compact enough for each search room seat to be equipped while leaving ample space for the searcher to take his notes. During the transition period, however, when registers as well as films are being used, searchers may find their working area rather cramped.

No doubt many of our searchers will regret that, as a result of the change-over, the original records will no longer be available for consultation. The volume format is very convenient to consult, and the handling of the actual records affords an aesthetic pleasure which substitutes such as microfilm can never evoke. Nevertheless, there are real advantages to be gained. The principal one is that the use of film will enable the original records to be conserved indefinitely in secure storage, but searchers will continue to have access to the information contained in them.

New Register House, Edinburgh
September 1976.

POINTS OF VIEW :—

LOSING OUR HERITAGE

By SHEILA PITCAIRN*

With very few exceptions the people who use the OLD PAROCHIAL REGISTERS OF SCOTLAND, which cover 901 parishes, are greatly perturbed at the projected gradual and seemingly irrevocable withdrawal of these records in favour of microfilm copies. The exceptions are people who are trying to be fair-minded about a proposal which on paper simply implies that the Registrar General and his Departmental Records Officer are carrying out a duty in preserving the registers for posterity.

The rising costs of repairs, particularly to expensive bindings, was giving cause for concern three or four years ago, and in typical Civil Service fashion a Records Officer was appointed, ostensibly to make recommendations. To him the answer to the problem was simple: withdraw the volumes and produce the microfilm copies made over twenty years ago. No consideration at all was given

*Sheila Pitcairn is a member of the Council of the Scottish Genealogy Society. A business woman and a professional genealogist, she has been admitted to membership of the Association of Genealogists and Record Agents, an organisation concerned with the standards of research services in Great Britain.

to the inconvenience his solution would cause, nor to the very real problems which the readers would face. Indeed little thought seems to have been given by the Department to the cost of the new officer himself: even less to the large sums of money which would be required to finance his half-baked ideas.

One would have thought that such a far-reaching proposal would have merited some consultation with the regular searchers at New Register House. The circular issued in September 1976, only one month before the first batch of records was withdrawn, attempts quite cleverly to convey the idea that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints will finance the venture. But who is paying the Records Officer? Surely the people he is serving in Scotland: rather badly in our view. And who is to pay for electrical work, and new microfilm readers costing around £300 each? Again the long suffering tax-payers, inclusive of those who use the records and pay fees for so doing.

The fact is that only a very small percentage of the registers have "fragile record pages", and the Records Officer evidently decided on withdrawal of the volumes before he was long enough in his post to examine them. There is no doubt that the number of record users has increased with the growing popularity of genealogical research, but this is not proof of "wear-and-tear". Taking advantage of the offer by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints to make improved microfilm copies, the Department is withdrawing a valuable part of our heritage. Our children will never become as familiar with the registers as we have been, nor experience the 'aesthetic pleasure' of reading these original records, made for the most part on strong, durable paper, with good ink. The writer conducted a careful study of the 177 volumes already withdrawn, and could find only minor defects, easily repairable. Where registers had been made up from fragments of various smaller records, they were in better shape than they were when deposited over a century ago by the Church of Scotland, believing no doubt that the originals would be available for consultation at all times. When one goes further and examines the sturdy volumes pertaining to Scottish towns like Inverness, Aberdeen, Dundee, St Andrews, Perth, Dunfermline, Edinburgh and Glasgow, and attempts to reconcile their condition with the case made out in the September circular, one can only feel bewilderment. Anyone who doubts this should arrange to examine the volumes. The evidence of good preservation IS THERE TO BE SEEN: clear and irrefutable.

It seems generally agreed that the 1841 census returns are in a deteriorated state, and will have to be made available on microfilm in the near future. This may also be true of the 1851 returns, as these in many cases seem to have been written with inferior ink on paper which is not very absorbent. But there is no excuse for so treating the returns of 1861, 1871, 1881 and 1891 although some minor repairs are required. Incidentally, this seems as good a time as any to advocate the opening for consultation of the 1901 returns, which could do no harm to anybody. It is paradoxical that Cabinet papers — conceivably affecting the security of the country—can be consulted after 30 years; while harmless census details of 70 years ago remain locked away by the bureaucrats.

The appointment of a Records Officer was as unnecessary as the extreme actions he is taking. Previously the Head Paper-Keeper, sometimes after con-

sultation with the Librarian, withdrew the volumes as they needed repairs, and the system worked well until it was decided that the cost was too high. The few volumes which suffer from "wear-and-tear" could have been photocopied in the same way as the registers of the Roman Catholic Church have been by the Scottish Record Office; or simply xeroxed for easier reading. This would have been more economical than the appointment of a Records Officer, who was in employment elsewhere. Even better perhaps, and less costly than the microfilm readers, which may eventually run up a total cost of over £9,000, the Registrar General's Office could have invested in a laminating machine, in order to envelope any "fragile record pages" in transparent protective coatings.

When the withdrawal of the *Old Parochial Registers* was discussed by the Council of the Scottish Genealogy Society, our Chairman intimated that he did not feel he should make out the case against the project as he had—as an individual—already approached his M.P., Mr Tam Dalyell, requesting an Ombudsman's Inquiry. At the time it was uncertain if this would be instituted, or what the outcome would be, and the writer agreed to make this contribution. She has moreover, written in similar vein to the Registrar General and to her own M.P., Mr Adam Hunter.

LETTER RECEIVED:—

Consternation is likely to be the first reaction by Scottish genealogists to the intimation that the original Old Parochial Registers of Scotland are now being withdrawn from public use, with microfilm copies provided as a substitute. The official announcement emanating from the New Register House will be and deserves to be examined with critical concern.

As a starting-point, it should never be forgotten that the OPRs, unlike the post-1855 registers, were initiated and maintained (albeit imperfectly and unevenly) by the Church, and it is to the faithfulness and diligence of local ministers and session clerks up and down the land, and not to any central registry, that we owe their existence. When those that survived were transmitted to the Registrar-General, it was enacted by Parliament (17 and 18 Vict. cap. 80 sec. 18) that he should undertake the double responsibility of preserving them and arranging that they "may be searched and certified copies of entries taken therefrom at all reasonable times by any person".

Preservation. Unlike some other important records now held by the State, the OPRs are literally irreplaceable from any other source, and it is therefore a primary duty to ensure their preservation. Future generations would rightly blame us, and their immediate custodians, if we handed them on to our successors in a worse condition than that in which we received them. The massive increase in their use, often by searchers unaccustomed in the handling of original records, has plainly brought the matter to a head. Those trained and experienced in record preservation, and others who make constant use of these records, are best qualified to judge whether the present drastic measure is necessary or desirable. That it will make use of the records less convenient can

hardly be denied by anyone who has ever consulted them systematically. The onus is therefore on the Registrar-General (to whom we find no reference by name or office in the official announcement) and his advisers to justify the decision, although we take it that the public are entitled to offer opinions both on its wisdom and on whether it is being reasonably carried out.

Public Access. Here we are more concerned with the second part of the Registrar-General's duty. Much more important than any "aesthetic pleasure" is the importance of direct contact with the original records in the form in which they were produced, for which surely no copy can be a complete substitute. It is true that—perhaps through some lack of vigilance on our part—the original Act was repealed, and a watered-down version of the section cited above was introduced in 1965 cap. 49 sec. 47; but surely there is a firm moral obligation on the State to continue to permit direct access to the originals when requested to do so. The official statement says: "it should not be necessary to have recourse to the original registers, except to elucidate doubtful readings on the film"; but later it qualifies this by saying that "as a result of the change-over the original records will no longer be available for consultation". It is vital, we think, that the searcher should be allowed some say in whether the original register should be made available, and that this should not be left to the arbitrary decision of a busy official, or only granted after some time-consuming process of form-filling or cross-questioning. Though now centrally preserved, these are primarily *local* records, and were produced as such, and the searcher is likely to have more specialised knowledge of the locality searched which may make him or her consider that recourse to the original record is desirable, in order to elucidate a doubtful reading, or to establish the significance of interpolations, alterations, erasures &c. (George Seton, *Sketch of the Parochial Records*, 1854, p 67). A person learned in the law has said that "the value of such records depends on the manner in which they were kept; and therefore the original ought to be produced" (Bell's *Principles of the Law of Scotland*)—and who would argue that a genealogist should not wish to be as strict as a lawyer in assessing the value of his evidence?

In expressing the hope that these matters will be kept in mind in carrying out this unwelcome decision, we would just add two other points. While withdrawal of the originals during filming seems to be an inevitable consequence of the policy being pursued, we are somewhat alarmed by the statement that prior to filming the OPR volumes will be broken down into folios by HMSO Binding Section at Sighthill. It is hoped that this mass operation will be supervised at some stage by persons competent to read even the earliest surviving registers. At least one case is known of a volume in which when originally bound some pages were displaced (probably because the clerk could not read even the page numbers correctly). Are steps being taken to remedy this and any similar errors?

Few would deny that the historian can learn something from the genealogist, just as the genealogist has much to learn from the historian (see e.g. Professor Gordon Donaldson, "The Significance of Genealogy to the Scottish His-

torian", *Scottish Genealogist* xxi 59-64). It was a failure to recognise this in the past that the late Hector McKechnie, Q.C., blamed for the situation that "archaeologists and fortune-seekers are mulcted alike" in searching the OPRs. What he wrote in his *Pursuit of Pedigree* fifty years ago is still worth pondering: "One has no objection to contributing to the expenses of the later series, which were formed by the State, and require a large staff for their management. But the older records, of course, were pirated from the Church, and in return the least that can be done is to maintain them free of charge", and, he added, to allow access to them other than for business purposes free of charge.

R. W. MUNRO
JEAN MUNRO

THE INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATES OF THE CADELL FAMILY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

by PATRICK CADELL

(cont. from page 76)

What happened in effect was that Matthews from having been in entire control of one complete manufacturing process, was now reduced to looking after only a part of it, even though the most important. His professional abilities had been called in question and this may explain the difficulties that lay ahead.

Early in the summer of 1767, there were complaints from the Board of Ordnance, first about irregularity in the fulfilling of orders for cannon, and then about the cannons being bored too large. If they had been bored too small, as Cadell pointed out, something could have been done about it, but if they were too large they were good for little more than scrap. Matthews had received several copies of the exact measurements of the cannon, but on 23rd May 1767, Garbett reports that for various reasons 51 Carron guns have been rejected by the Board. He goes on to suggest that Matthews should only be paid for cannon which were accepted, and he also asks whether a second resident partner would be a help. The man suggested was Ambrose Tibbats who had recently put some money into the company. The Cadells seem to have disliked Tibbats for some reason. This particular suggestion was not taken up and when Tibbats was proposed as a possible husband for Cadell's sister Christian, the family were united in opposition, the men on account of his financial position, the lady herself on account of his person.

By June 6th the question of an assistant for Matthews had arisen. It was considered impossible for one man to supervise the four blast furnaces that were now in operation, and Cadell felt that his activities should be confined to nos. 3 and 4, the new powerful furnaces that had just recently been installed. By the end of July an assistant had been appointed. Garbett while admitting

that Matthews had been guilty of 'great inaccuracy and slovenliness', still felt that he was perfectly capable of managing four furnaces, but he acquiesced in the employment of an other supervisor for the two older furnaces.

On the 31st of July, Garbett wrote that one of the company's London agents had seen guns which he described as a 'disgrace to the Work'. Garbett continues, 'If there is not an immediate and effectual alteration in our conduct, we may expect . . . the Board will soon say they won't be teased with us . . . Surely Matthews after what hath passed will not be so base to us as to hasard our property and our disgrace by sending more insufficient guns'.

But Garbett was unwilling to let Matthews go. On October the 1st he writes, 'I acknowledge I should be extremely sorry to part with Matthews . . . his ability and firmness are in my opinion more than common. I know he hath expressed discontent at being treated unkindly and ungenerously though I never heard any complaints of not being sufficiently paid . . . I may be mistaken in his character; if it is thought so I should be glad to have a public examination of his faults and neglects, for indeed I will not wish any man to continue at Carron whatever his abilities may be who behaves with insolence merely from his own humour, though a little humour or pettishness will too commonly happen in servants who in such a station as Matthews' may be very valuable'. It must have been extremely galling for Cadell to have his strongly felt views set aside in the face of such good evidence. A properly independent managing director would have been rid of Matthews the moment he found him incompetent. Cadell clearly felt himself unable to take the necessary action.

In reply to Garbett's letter of the 1st, Cadell observes, 'I know of no cause that Mr Matthews has to complain of being unkindly or ungenerously used; on the contrary it has always been my endeavour to use him with kindness, but I have had the utmost cause to be dissatisfied . . . My situation is indeed a most unhappy one, if after seven years of most slavish attention of body and mind in the establishment of these works, any attempt to remedy capital defects is to be explained into unkind or ungenerous usage . . . and what makes my situation still more disagreeable is to have such letters on the subject of money and profits when the shortcomings are in a great measure the consequence of these defects . . . I hope that the partners will deliberately consider the best plan possible and determinedly assist in the execution of it, and not leave the whole burthen on my shoulders, with people for whose feeling and steady attention to the profit of the works I cannot be accountable'.

The friction between Cadell and Matthews, and the arguments between him and Garbett dragged on for some months more, and the ultimate outcome is not known but it bedevilled the later years that Cadell spent at Carron, and there can be no doubt that it seriously impaired the company's efficiency.

The financial problem was simpler, but in many respects much more serious. The Company was originally launched with a capital of £12,000; £3,000 from Roebuck, £3,000 from Garbett, £3,000 from the two Cadells between them, and £3,000 from other members of the Roebuck family. It became apparent very early on that this was totally insufficient. By May 1760, outgoings on construction work had reached £200 a week, without any commensurate return. The company turned to the banks and managed to negotiate large overdrafts, but

in 1762 the banks began to feel insecure and started to call in their money. The company got over the immediate crisis by means of a loan from Lord Milton, but clearly something more permanent was required.

The first resource seemed to be the raising of more capital from the partners. This the Cadells could not, or would not contemplate. The original £3,000 had pushed them to the limits of their family finances, and although they were doing reasonably well in their other enterprises, they felt very unwilling to subscribe more to Carron. They also never failed to point out that their original idea had been a single furnace on a river in East Lothian, not the huge works in process of construction on the Carron. They were therefore prepared to see their holding reduced from 6/24 to 4/24 so as to accommodate new partners. Various further expedients were tried, including increasing the value of each share to £5,000, and admitting the firm's bankers and agents as partners. By 1770, the subscribed capital of the firm was nearly £130,000.

These problems were bad enough in themselves but were aggravated by Roebuck. In 1765, the company began to make a profit for the first time. It was not a great profit, but it was better than anything that had been made in the previous five years. Roebuck's immediate reaction was to push for the construction of two bigger and better blast furnaces. Roebuck was a man of tremendous enthusiasm, and great powers of persuasion (Alexander Carlyle beside one or two less flattering epithets described him as an 'inventive genius' and 'an endless projector'; Garbett was eventually reduced to calling him 'really a wild man'). One can only suppose that Garbett and the Cadells were against further expansion in the meantime. They were aware of the financial situation, but finance always came far down Roebuck's list of priorities. Besides he had been Garbett's employer, he was old enough to be young Cadell's father, and old Cadell, already quite elderly, was running the family's affairs in East Lothian, and because he was given to worrying was perhaps not kept as fully informed as he should have been. Roebuck therefore had his way, and the third and fourth furnaces were constructed.

For various technical reasons these furnaces required more power than the earlier ones, and so in addition to the further outlay on them, money had to be spent on a better application of the water in the river. These annoyances were worsened by the very dry summer of 1767, when there was so little water in the river that the works were at a standstill for nearly three months. This of course coincided with the difficulties with Matthews, and the rejection of the cannon. In money matters therefore, the company did not have its troubles to seek.

How did Carron get out of these difficulties? No mention has been made so far of one of the early—though not founding—partners, Charles Gascoigne. It was he who by a combination of charm and unscrupulousness turned what was apparently a hopeless enterprise into one of the most flourishing ironworks of its day.

He was half Scottish. His father was Woodgrave Gascoigne, an illegitimate offshoot of the family of Gascoigne of Parlington in Yorkshire, and a professional soldier. His mother was Grizel, daughter of the 9th Lord Elphinstone. Garbett had met Gascoigne, then only a boy, in 1750, when he was staying with

his mother near Prestonpans, apparently in somewhat reduced circumstances, and invited him some years later to join him in Birmingham. In 1759, Gascoigne married Garbett's only daughter Mary, and as a wedding present, his father-in-law obtained for him a partnership in a London drysalting business. His activities were extended in 1763 to a turpentine factory and shipping company at Carronwharf, and it seems that he was Garbett's representative at Carron. In April 1764, he became a shareholder in the company.

Gascoigne was quite a different man from the other partners. Roebuck was a technical innovator, Garbett was a solid, persevering entrepreneur, the Cadells were merchants seeking to turn an honest penny—all in fact typical men of the industrial revolution. Gascoigne seems quite simply to have been ambitious for power. This would be understood today when power is largely to be found in finance and industry, but in 18th century Scotland it was a strange phenomenon, and being totally unrecognised and unsuspected by the other partners, it was much more successful than it would perhaps be today.

More difficult to understand perhaps is why Gascoigne should have fixed on Carron as the scene of his activities. Things were not going well when he joined, and were to go worse before his influence was felt. But Gascoigne had a great contempt for finance. He could manage it in a highly skillful way when his interest was engaged, but at other times he could neglect it disastrously. He became personally bankrupt in 1772, when his shipping business had debts of £200,000, but he continued to manage Carron.

Gaining control of Carron meant disposing of all the partners senior to him. Roebuck was by far the most vulnerable, and he was the first to go. In April 1764 he had raised money for his mining activities at Kinneil on the security of his Carron stock, and at the same time withdrew a considerable sum of money from the Roebuck and Garbett partnership, which of course still continued as a separate business in Birmingham. Garbett naturally became anxious to detach his name from Roebuck's as it was clear that Roebuck was becoming a liability, and so it was agreed that Roebuck's shares should be taken over by Garbett's son Francis, and by Gascoigne; but it was at first to appear only as a mortgage in case other partners, notably the Cadells should object. Roebuck's association with the company which had been his brainchild ceased in December 1768. After this time Roebuck's name is continually linked with industry in and around Bo'ness. Kinneil became one of the most modern mines in the country, and Roebuck's patronage of James Watt is well known. He was involved with potteries and soda works in Bo'ness and though he eventually went bankrupt, he died still in control of the mines at Kinneil in 1794. „

After Roebuck's departure it was the turn of the Cadells to be pushed out; as this episode is very much concerned with Gascoigne's arrangements for the financial recovery of the company, the two things can be considered together. He had it in mind to dispose of the Cadells from early on. Young Cadell was the obvious major threat to the fulfillment of his ambitions. He was already manager, and very much Gascoigne's age. Left alone he might continue in that post for many years. As Gascoigne wrote to Francis Garbett, he was content 'that Mr Cadell continue to manage till we have a proper opportunity of either bringing him down to act as a good servant *only*, or the power of making him

tired of it, and then in either case to accommodate ourselves accordingly'. Cadell was aware of the danger of his being treated as a servant, and resisted it strongly, but he made no bones about saying on occasions that he was tired of the job and would gladly be out of it.

There is unfortunately no very clear record of how Gascoigne replaced Cadell early in 1769. There was a partners' meeting then, apparently the first for several years, at which Cadell may even have asked to be relieved. At all events Gascoigne took over management then. His first action was to produce a revaluation of the company's assets. By writing down the value of the works themselves by 8% a year, by writing off 5% of the bad debts due to the company, and by reducing the book value of the woods belonging to Carron which had been partly cut, he contrived to show (after deduction of the debts that the company owed) that Carron was worth about half the sum which had been subscribed up to that point by the partners.

Whatever purpose this particular financial statement was supposed to have, it effectively had that of discrediting the previous management, and of making the other partners place even more reliance on Gascoigne to get them out of the financial mess which he so vividly brought to their notice. Cadell remained at Carron for a short while as the partner responsible for seeing to the supply of raw materials, but not for long. Gascoigne promulgated a new partnership agreement which would prevent any partner from dealing in iron in any form, otherwise than for Carron. The Cadells had purchased the estate of Banton in 1767 for its ironstone, and in any case as general merchants could not allow their freedom of action to be so hampered. They therefore refused to sign, and by 1773 the family had severed all connection with Carron.

In due course Gascoigne got the company's finances back on their feet by borrowing comparatively small sums from several banks, rather than a large sum from one or two, so that when one debt fell due for repayment, he borrowed to meet it. Borrowing from Peter to pay Paul was not perhaps very honest, but by the time one of the links in the chain was broken by the failure of a bank, the company's finances were reasonably secure.

He then turned his attention to ousting his father-in-law. He knew Garbett was in money difficulties, and in February 1777 he arranged that the partners at Carron should forfeit his and Garbett's shares.—their family finances being almost inextricably mixed up—on the grounds that they had large unsettled accounts due to the company. Garbett was of course obliged to leave, but Gascoigne was manager and so stayed. When Garbett objected to these proceedings in 1778, and came to Scotland to look after his affairs, Gascoigne arranged for him to be imprisoned for debt. He eventually paid the debt which was the immediate cause of his imprisonment, and fled to Berwick upon Tweed from where he tried to establish his claims, but to no avail. Remarkably, in spite of all, Garbett maintained for Gascoigne 'the sort of affection which fathers have for a culpable and peevish child. Charles has eminent abilities, but his wildness needs restraint'.

The financial problems had been sorted; the managerial ones solved themselves. An anonymous report, thought to be by Gascoigne, was produced in the

late 1760s. It advocated amongst other things that the managing partner should actually manage, and that while obviously he should be responsible to his colleagues, he should not be expected to refer every small day to day decision to them. Cadell had been too correct in his reference to his co-partners; Gascoigne, by pushing out those likely to stand in his way effectively put into practice the principle laid down in the report.

Apart from running the company in a fairly autocratic manner, Gascoigne's management showed no particular originality. Once the basic problems had been solved, Carron only had to be run sensibly to be profitable. Gascoigne's personal debts however were large and unsettled—and they remained so until 1827, 21 years after his death. Gascoigne's daughter Anne married the ageing Earl of Haddington in 1786, much to the horror of Lord Binning who did not care for the union of his family with 'that Clanjamfray' as he described Gascoigne and his relations. In that year, Gascoigne, feeling perhaps that his financial affairs in this country were reasonably secure, and having received permission from Pitt to go to Russia to supervise the installation of cannon-making machinery there, took the opportunity to stay. He received various appointments under the Russian crown, including the management of many Russian ironworks, especially at Olonets and in the region of St Petersburg. He is thought to have returned to this country—possibly in 1794 on Lord Haddington's death—but he had to leave from Tynninghame very hurriedly in a fishing boat to escape his creditors. He died in 1806, having been rewarded for his work by the gift of large estates, 2,000 serfs, and the order of St Vladimir 3rd class.

Garbett went bankrupt in 1772; but he was a man of such notable integrity that he was put in charge of the newly established Birmingham assay office, and his work there, in collaboration with his son, was of considerable importance in the history and development of the mint.

The Cadell family, having got out of Carron with a sigh of relief, turned all its energies to the smaller and more diverse occupations which were its natural element. But it was a very different family now from the one which had so hesitatingly entered Carron eleven years before. Though it was still shy of really large undertakings, there could be no return to the small family business to which William senior had been bred, and henceforth the family's main interest was in heavy industry, ironmaking and coal. The late eighteenth century however saw the greatest variety in the family's activities, and it is probably this variety which ensured its economic survival—but which also ensured that it never attained real industrial eminence. It is worth noting in passing however, that of all the founding partners at Carron, the Cadells were the only ones not to go bankrupt.

William Cadell junior was totally occupied at Carron from early 1760 until 1769, but his father and his younger brother John (1740-1814) managed the family's affairs in East Lothian. These consisted principally of shipping, colliery management, and from around 1756 of a pottery which made a large variety of stoneware, much of it for export, at Prestonpans. From about 1770, the family began to expand its activities. The estate of Banton had been

acquired in 1767, mainly for its minerals; in 1770 the family took over the Cramond ironworks; and in 1771 it leased the coal and ironstone under the estate of Grange at Bridgeness on the Forth, finally buying the estate outright in 1790. In addition to these there were a papermill at Auchendinny, salt pans at Cockenzie and Bridgeness, a flint mill at Seton, the lease of collieries at Pitfirrane, and for a while young William managed the Callender estate for the York Buildings Company, and the lands of Auchenbowie for Ninian Lewis of West Plean, an East India ship's captain during one of his long voyages. Towards the end of the century the family was involved with several notable west of Scotland enterprises such as the Clyde Ironworks, Muirkirk Ironworks, and the Forth and Clyde Shipping Company.

In most of these the Cadell interest was small, and in some cases—particularly Clyde—unwilling, but Cramond, Grange and Auchendinny were important businesses.

Auchendinny Mill was acquired from the Annandale family who ran it (and continued to run it under Cadell control) in 1782, probably at the instigation of Katherine Inglis, daughter of Archibald Inglis of Auchendinny, William's wife, who was sentimentally attached to the area. The mill was burnt down in 1785, but it was rebuilt, and remained in Cadell hands until about 1860. It produced high quality paper, used by printers not merely in this country, but as far afield as America. Auchendinny was always under exclusive Cadell control, and for that reason lies somewhat outside the scope of this article. This is not true, however, of Cramond or Grange.

When William junior in collaboration with his brother John, leased Grange from the London financier William Belchier who had acquired it as a speculation in 1768, he had no intention of becoming a coalmaster. He had known all too well the disadvantages of being tied down in the one place, and he considered himself a merchant rather than an industrialist. He and John therefore brought in John Beaumont, son of John Beaumont of Denton, near Newcastle, several of whose sons were working in Scottish industry.

The arrangement was that Beaumont would manage the mines, and raise 200 tons of coal a week which it would then be the Cadells' job to sell. But Beaumont never managed to do this; between November 1775 and November 1778, he was short in 132 weeks, and in 1779 the average weekly product of the mine was about 90 tons. The Cadells complained about this, and in fact in 1780 they agreed to overlook Beaumont's considerable debt to the company if he relinquished his partnership forthwith.

The cause of this state of affairs had nothing to do with the nature of the coal at Bo'ness or with Beaumont's competence. Late in 1772, William writes to his lawyer, 'We trusted in his abilities and attention . . . of these we have been deprived by his late matrimonial connection', and when he expostulated to Beaumont's father, he was told that a 'petticoat will draw more than a team of horses'. What had happened was that in November 1772, Beaumont had married Elisabeth Montgomery of Lainshaw, widow of Alexander Montgomery-Cunningham of Kirktonholme. The estate of Lainshaw was a valuable one, and Beaumont spent rather too much of his time there, and rather too little at

Grange. In settlement of his debts, he offered the Cadells a bond over Lainshaw, and actually tried to sell part of the estate in 1773. The Cadells probably started pressing for the repayment of the bond in the difficult financial years of the 1770s, and Beaumont was finally obliged to sell the estate in 1778 to William Cunningham, the great Virginia merchant. He seems however to have kept some interest in the Lainshaw mines, for when in 1792, Walter Neilson the colliery engineer at Lainshaw, had to give a name to his seventh son, the famous inventor of the hot blast, he called him James Beaumont Neilson.

Beaumont's successor was John Grieve. Grieve is one of those curious figures who appear in a variety of prominent positions in Scottish industry, but about whom little is known. His first job seems to have been as a clerk to Roebuck during the early years of his tenancy of the mines at Kinneil. He left there to work for Patrick Miller of Dalswinton, the banker. In 1772, described as 'a most accurate accountant, and uncommonly able, exact and diligent', he came to Grange, and the letters and minutes in his beautiful handwriting are the main source of information on the progress of the colliery in the 1770s. He was also an important witness in the dispute which arose between Roebuck and the Cadells in 1776 over the exact boundary between their estates, and more important over the exact boundary of the coal which lay beneath. It may easily have been Grieve's inside knowledge which brought to light Roebuck's encroachments on the Grange coal.

In 1773 he was given a share in the company by way of encouragement, but in 1787 he left to become manager of the newly founded ironworks at Muirkirk in Ayrshire, where he remained until late in 1789, at which moment he seems to disappear from view. After his departure Grange was owned exclusively by the Cadell family, and has been until now. The coal was exploited by the Cadells until nationalisation in 1947. It became, around 1800, the home of James John Cadell, William's third son through whom the family is descended, and remains to this day the centre of the family's activities.

When the Cadell family became sole owners of Cramond ironworks in the autumn of 1770, they found themselves in possession of a small rolling and slitting mill managed by Thomas Edington (1742-1810). Edington was probably born near Duns, and seems to have had some knowledge of iron works in the north of England, particularly those at Bedlington in Northumberland. He was engaged by Carron as a traveller about March 1764. In 1765 he became manager at Cramond, and stayed on in that capacity after 1770. In 1772, he became a partner, and in the same year married William Cadell's sister Christian.

Edington was an extremely active man, and there can be no doubt that the prosperity of Cramond in the late 18th century, in spite of lack of space and capital for expansion, and in spite of swiftly growing competition from other firms, was largely due to him. But just because he was so active, he chafed at the confined conditions at Cramond, and although he remained a partner until about 1800, his interests from about 1786 lay elsewhere. He was a partner at Muirkirk in 1787 and in 1786, he was the prime mover in the foundation of the Clyde ironworks, which in spite of a bad start, survived until in recent times it was taken over by Colville's. It is also possible that he may have had a stake in

the Dalnottar company (a company which had been founded in 1769 and which brought together John Gillies who had once been a Carron clerk, and William Cunningham of Lainshaw) which frequently combined with Cramond to buy Russian pigiron at cheap rates. Certainly his son Thomas actually owned Dalnottar in 1820. Edington's name is linked finally with the Phoenix Ironworks in Glasgow and at his death he was known as the owner of that firm. His sons John, Thomas and James were all involved with Phoenix in 1811, and James is still described as an ironmerchant in 1844.

The Cadell family it can be seen, was associated with some of the greatest names in the history of the Industrial Revolution in Scotland, and in its own way, by its participation and by its encouragement of young talents and energies contributed to it. While it cannot claim to be one of the great industrial dynasties of the period, it nevertheless deserves honourable mention amongst those who by their hard work, honesty and enterprise created the right conditions for the great industrial expansion of Scotland in the 19th century.

Virtually all the information in this article comes from the Cadell of Grange papers in the National Library of Scotland (Acc. 5381), with a certain amount of subsidiary material from the Carron papers in the Scottish Record Office (GD 58). In addition information on the earliest William Cadell is to be found in the minute book of the incorporation of the wrights of Haddington (SRO B 30/18/4), and on the later careers of John Grieve and Thomas Edington in George Thomson, 'The Dalnotter Iron Company' *Scottish Historical Review*, no 119 p. 10, and in J. R. Hume and J. Butt, 'Muirkirk', 1786-1802', S. H. R. no. 140, p. 160.

QUERIES

CADENHEAD: Under the Parish St Nicholas, there appears in the "Family of Cadenhead" book, the following references to Moses Cadenhead:—1754. Moses Cadenhead, sailor, had a son Alexander baptized. 1762. Moses Cadenhead, designed as midshipman on board His Majesty's Navy, purchased a large ancient house in Shiprow for himself and Margaret Calder, his spouse, in conjunct fee and liferent, and in 1771, he gave Power of Attorney to William Burnett, Advocate in Aberdeen, on the narrative that by his way of life and frequent residence in foreign parts, he cannot personally attend to the management of his affairs — under which power Mr Burnett sold the property in 1782. Jamaica June 1804. Last will and testament, proved at London 12 Nov. 1804. No reference is made in the book "The Family of Cadenhead" to his forbears and any information in this direction would be greatly appreciated.—F. Cadenhead, 57 Saffrons Court, Compton Place Road, Eastbourne, Sussex.

BRADBURY: Thomas Bradbury, a member of an old Sussex family which had roots in Scotland (being connected with Lord Galloway and the Earl of Huntingdon) emigrated to New England in 1634. Correspondence would be gladly entered into with anyone having knowledge of his descent and ancestry by Nathaniel Davis, 14 Tauhenstrasse, 3011 Bern, Switzerland.

STEWART: Charles Stewart married Ann Nicolson at Aberfeldy, Perthshire, on 7th October 1780; they had seven children, Donald (b. 28 August 1784, m. Ellen Stewart 1813), John, Charles, Malcolm, Isabella, Catherine and Jennie (b. 1800). Charles and the family emigrated to Prince Edward Island, Canada in 1804 (but not Ann, who was perhaps dead). Any information about the date and place of death of Charles, or about the later movements of the family or about Ellen Stewart would be welcomed. The enquirer would be happy to correspond with anyone whose Stewart relatives emigrated to Prince Edward Island — Donald F. Stewart, 138 Bunbury Road, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Canada CIA 7G8.

MILNE, MILLEN: Birth of William on 22 September 1818, son of John Milne or Millen and Margaret Durno or Donaldson. Place of birth always described as Forfarshire but not traced. Any likely birth entry would be much appreciated from any part of Scotland. 1851 CENSUS: wanted William Milne or Millen, 32 farm worker; Susan Milne or Millen, 24. Born Glamis, Angus. They were married at Glamis in January, 1851, daughter Mary born at Kildalton, Isle of Islay, September 1851. Not traced on 1851 census. I need this census return as they left Scotland after the child was born so do not appear on any further census—Mrs Sue M. Harris, 37 Woods Avenue, Matua, Tauranga, New Zealand.

SCOTT: Walter, chimney sweep, born Ireland c. 1801 (1851 census) died 9 July, 1869 in Hawick Poorhouse—married Agnes TURNBULL born Hawick, c. 1801. Known children: of Walter and Agnes: Mary born c. 1828 Hawick, Robert born c. 1830 Hawick, James Buchan born c. 1833 Hawick mar. Janet Nichol, John born 1 Aug., 1835 Hawick, Isabella born c. 1838 Hawick. Known Children of James and Janet: Agnes born c. 1861 Hawick, Helen born c 1857 Hawick, Robert born 26 March, 1866, mar. 30 Dec., 1898—Isabella Halliday.. Would like to hear from anyone interested in these Scott, Nichol or Halliday families. Particularly wanted: birth of Walter, marriage of Walter & Agnes. Names of Walter's parents —Mrs Sue M. Harris, 37 Woods Avenue, Matua, Tauranga, New Zealand.

GIFFORD: On 17 August 1749 were married in the Reformed Church of Maassluis in the Netherlands: Jan (=John) Gilbertsson Gifford and Cornelia Stavenis. The marriage certificate mentions that he is born on Hitland (one of the Shetland Islands).. Can anyone tell me how I can get more information about this Jan Gifford, his father Gilbert Gifford, his mother.—F. Kwekel, Wulpstraat 24, Hellevoetsluis, Netherlands.

CAMPBELL: Need information on the Hugh Campbell family who left Scotland between 1800 and 1804 for America and landed at Wilmington, North Carolina. Hugh was born about 1767, and his wife's name is believed to have been Sarah. He brought with him three sons—John (born about 1785), Duncan (born about 1795) and Malcolm (born about 1797). and two daughters—Catherine and one daughter said to have been lost at sea. The grave marker of one of the sons states he was born in "Nabdal, Scotland" which is interpreted as Knapdale, Argyll. The family settled in North Carolina near the small community of Wag-

ram. Please contact: William James Smith, 1642 Regency Drive, Burlington, North Carolina 27215, U.S.A.

CROSBIE—David Crosbie (c1807—prior to 1855) and his wife, Agnes Crosbie (maiden surname Crosbie). Their son William Crosbie, born at Cornlea, Irongray, Dumfriesshire, 29 Nov. 1832, who, at the time of his marriage to Isabella Paterson of Lochrutton, Kirkcudbrightshire, lived in Maxwelltown, Dumfries (town). Prior to 1867 he moved to High Station, Falkirk, where, as Foreman joiner for the North British Railway, he died 28 July 1892. Any information on David & Agnes Crosbie, their family or parents would be appreciated by Miss M. S. Johnston, 2725 Western Avenue, North Vancouver, B.C., V7N 3L3, Canada.

CAMPBELL—Duncan Campbell, born in Scotland, served as an officer in the 42nd Regiment, The Black Watch, in America, fighting in the French and Indian Wars 1754 to 1760. He was apparently married and had four sons all born in Scotland (Duncan born 1732 married Mary Christie in 1762 and died 1808, John, Archibald and Thomas, born in 1744 and died in New York 1825). All the sons lived in America and fought in the Revolution.

Any information about their father Duncan Campbell and his wife would be welcomed by Mrs Louis Baxter Hall, 621 Amboy Street, Anaheim, California 92802, U.S.A.

REVIEW

Logan, G. Murray, SCOTTISH HIGHLANDERS AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1976. Obtainable through H. H. Marshall, 3731 Macintosh Street, N.S. \$5.00.

The title of the book should not be understood as all-embracing, as the work is largely a history of the Royal Highland Emigrant Regiment (1775-1784), numbered in 1778 as the 84th, and it is the author's original research relating to the regiment which makes it valuable.

Dr Logan tells us much about recruitment, organisation and training of the 84th. He gives in proper perspective the role played in recruitment by Capt. Alexander McDonald, a veteran of the French War and—it is said—a scion of the McDonalds of Ardnamurchan (which he mistakenly places on the island of Mull). There is much information about personnel, and probably the only complete Muster Roll of the first battalion of the regiment. Moreover, there is a list of the men discharged in Nova Scotia in 1783 and 1784. One of these, James Mor Fraser, from Aird, Invernesshire, who settled at Strathavon, East River, Pictou, was an ancestor of the author.

Reference is made to the importance in the formation of the Royal Highland Emigrant Regiment of the voyage of the Scottish emigrant ship *Glasgow*, which was detained in New York Harbour by H.M.S. *Asia* on 3rd October 1775, when ten seamen were pressed into the King's Service. The ship sailed from Boston with 225 emigrants on 5th November, where Major John Small, of the Royal Highland Emigrants, persuaded the men to enlist. After demobilisation they were

to be given grants of Land in Nova Scotia. The ship reprovisioned and left for Halifax, to discharge the emigrants and their worldly goods.

In the early parts of his work, Dr Logan makes some statements with which we disagree. The first of these is in attributing to Pitt the idea of giving the virtue of the Scottish Highlanders "a safe direction", by enlisting them for military service. The great statesman himself made this claim in his famous eulogy on the Highland regiments in 1776, but he — like many other politicians — had turned a complete somersault in the interests of expediency.

Thirty years before the ministry of the Earl of Chatham, the foundations were laid by the formation of six Independent Companies which became known as The Black Watch. The idea of lawful military service for Highlanders reached fruition through the counsels of two Scots, Duncan Forbes of Culloden, and Archibald Campbell, Lord Islay (who became Duke of Argyll in 1743). Forbes drew up a paper in 1738, which was laid before Sir Robert Walpole by Lord Islay, and accepted. This resulted in *Am Freiceadan Dubh* becoming the 42nd Regiment (Royal Highlanders) in 1739. They covered themselves in glory at Fontenoy in 1744, at a time when Pitt was denouncing on principle any additions to a standing army. The Royal Highland Regiment formed part of the force sent out under Abercromby, which landed at New York in June, 1756, six months before the elder Pitt formed his ministry, during which further battalions of Highlanders were recruited. If further proof is needed, it may be pointed out that the legislation of 1747 which prohibited the Highland dress, excepted use as a regimental uniform.

The author's statement that the Highland emigrants in America were opposed to the Revolution "almost to a man", is open to question. No statistics are available and it might just as easily be argued that a majority adopted the principles of the Revolution. Certainly the Highlanders in Georgia, under General Lachlan McIntosh distinguished themselves in the American interest. Others in Pennsylvania did likewise. General Arthur St Clair, a native of Thurso, who settled there, fought at Ticonderoga and Brandywine. Highlanders in New York also sided with the Americans, notably General Alexander McDougal, from Islay, who fought at Germantown, and became a Congressman. George Rogers Clark, whose exploits between Kentucky and the Great Lakes have been hailed as a military classic, was of Scottish descent.

It would have been interesting to read of other Scottish regiments which took part in the Revolutionary War: the 42nd or Royal Highland Regiment; the 71st, or Fraser's Highlanders; the 74th, or Argyll Highlanders; and the 76th, or McDonald's Highlanders. Two complimentary items regarding the former appear in *List of American Documents in the Scottish Record Office* (Edinburgh: H.M. Stationery Office, 1976). One is a List of Transports from the Clyde, 29th April, 1776, and is a microfilm of a document in the Black Watch Museum. The other is a notebook kept by Lt. John Peebles who sailed on the *Thames* on that date. He lists the ships which carried the Royal Highland Regiment, and mentions the two battalions of Fraser's Highlanders which left at the same time. The *List of American Documents* includes moreover, a number of items among the *MacLaine of Lochbuie Muniments*, relating to the 84th Regiment.

Sennachie

REGISTER OF RESEARCH

maintained by

Mrs Lesley Gordon, Cowden Cleuch, Dalkeith EH22 2NB
(Second Instalment)

(continued from page 69)

Whether willing to exchange information	Family Being Researched	County	Name and Address* Tel. No.	Non members private or professional
Yes	Bruce	Scotland Leeds see also 33a	58 Frank Bruce, 4 Oakwell Oval, Roundhay, Leeds LS8 4AL	Private See Vol. XXIII.i.70
Yes	Scottish Episcopal Church	Diocese of Moray Ross, Caithness and generally	59 W. A. Campbell, 7 North West Circus Place, Edinburgh 3	Private
Yes	Fleming Gray Learmont see p. 34a	Roxburghshire and Berwickshire	60 Wm. Fleming, Roseneath, Tudhoe, Spennymoor, Co Durham DL16 6LL	Private
	Clark (assoc. fam.) Ferguson Henry McMichael (assoc. fam.) McGill Hamilton Millar (assoc. fam.) Morton	Galloway Galloway Galloway Galloway Galloway Ayrshire Ayrshire (Strathaven) Ayrshire Ayrshire	61 David James Mac- Michael, 'Coire Beag', 6 Frere Way, Fingringhoe, Colchester C05 7BP	
	Card Index Death notices appearing in newspapers, periodicals, S.W. Scot. 1773-1855	Galloway	62 Miss Shiela Ford, 5 Parkhead Loaning, Dumfries DG1 3BX	
	Baxter Lyon MacPherson (Cluny) and (Beann-a-Char)	Dundee Angus Badenoch anywhere	63 J. Baxter, 65 Canterbury Road, Redcar TS10 3QG (see also 29a)	Tel. 06493 4149

Whether willing to exchange information	Family Being Researched	County	Name and Address* Tel. No.	Non members private or professional
	Gordons	Kenmure Galloway W. Bromwich Dudley	64 Maj.-Gen. R. R. Gordon CBE, DSO, ED, 253 Pascoe Vale Road, Lessendon, Victoria, Australia 3040	
	Cant (assoc. fam.)	Angus P. Barry Panbride	65 R. A. Cant, 3 London Road, Baldock, Herts., SG7 6LE	
Yes	Alexander	Angus, Rescobie, Forfar Murroes area	65 R. A. Cant, 3 London Road, Baldock, Herts SG 7 6LE	Private
Yes	Bremner	Angus, Arbroath area Fife	R. A. Cant, 3 London Road, Baldock, Herts SG 7 6LE	
Yes	Mollison	Cameron area Angus mainly P. Aberlemno	R. A. Cant, 3 London Road, Baldock, Herts SG 7 6LE	
Yes	Wallace	Angus, mainly P. Barry, Panbride	R. A. Cant, 3 London Road, Baldock, Herts SG 7 6LE	
Yes	Campbell	Kilfinan and Rothesay	66 Lindsay Campbell, 12 Swiss Avenue, Gonville, Wanganui, New Zealand	Private
Yes	McGibbon	Kilfinan and Rothesay Argyllshire		
Yes	McDonell	Buteshire Auchluarach, Fort Augustus		
Yes	MacRae	Inverness shire Auchluarach, Fort Augustus, Inverness-shire		
Yes	Duff (assoc. fam.)	Perthshire, City of Perth P. of Logierait P. of Auchtergaven	67 C. J. Duff, 58 Griffiths Road, London SW19 1ST	Private

Whether willing to exchange information	Family Being Researched	County	Name and Address* Tel. No.	Non members private or professional
	Lothian (Loudin, Lowden)	Perthshire, City of Perth P. of Logierait P. of Auchtergaven		
	McNaughton	Perthshire, City of Perth P. of Logierait P. of Auchtergaven		
	Fenwick	Perthshire, City of Perth P. of Logierait P. of Auchtergaven Glasgow		
	Shields, Shiells, Shiels* Hall*	Edinburgh Midlothian Galashiels	68 Mrs Janet Watherstone McLaren 523 Tay Street, Invercargill N. Z.	Private and Professional*
	McFarlane*	Dunkeld Butterstone Clunie Parish		
	Scott	Dunkeld Butterstone Clunie Parish		Professional
	Mann	Midlothian Galashiels		Private
	Gray	Black Isle		Private
	Morton	Edinburgh		Private
	McLaren	Alloa?		Private
	McMinn			Private
	Watherstone			Private
	Sandison	Worldwide	69 A. Sandison, 93 Ridgemount Gdns., London WC1E 7AZ	Private
Yes	Scollay	Shetland	69 A. Sandison 93 Ridgemount Gardens London WC1E 7AZ	Private
	Mainland Pole	Shetland origin Shetland origin		
Yes	McLachlan MacLachlan	Worldwide	70 Tom McLachlan 76 Valley Fields Crescent, Enfield Middlesex	Private

Whether willing to exchange information	Family Being Researched	County	Name and Address* Tel. No.	Non members private or professional
Yes	Aird Cloudsley Low	Kirkmichael, Ayrshire Garvock, Kincardineshire and area Kincardineshire Angus, (Forfarshire) P. of Marykirk, Fettercairn, Logie-Pert, Dun and area	71 Jas. W. A. Low 111 Rainsford Road Toronto, Ontario Canada	Private
Yes	Bethune Whitehead Galloway	Fife E. and M. Lothian Fife	72 Andrew J. Bethune 8 Blackwood Crescent Edinburgh EH9 1QY	Private
Yes	Love Niven Briggs Miller Callan or Calland Blain Todd Blair	Kirkoswald Ayrshire Kirkbean Kirkcudbrightshire Dumfries Roberton Roxburghshire Dumfries Stanley Perthshire Cairny Hill Perthshire	73 Miss M. Love 482 Church Street Apt. 1201 Toronto M4Y 2C7 Canada	Private
Yes	Lyall Hume Paton Goodfellow Elliot Whitecross Coghill	Peebles Along the Border Caithness	74 J. A. Hume 49 Clovelly Avenue Glenroy, Melbourne Australia 75 R. F. Coghill Tighnan Uinneag 62 Sharps Lane Ruislip, Middlesex MA4 7JQ	Private
Yes	Allison	Dalkeith	76 Hilda Fairbairn Downey (Mrs George Downey) Eskadale Farm Tiverton, Ontario Canada NOG 2TO	Private

Whether willing to exchange information	Family Being Researched	County	Name and Address* Tel. No.	Non members private or professional
Yes	Brown	Roxburghshire and Lowlands		Private
	Cairns Calder	Roxburghshire Petty Parish Calder Beachley Farm		
	Charters Cowan	Kirkpatrick—Durham Causeway Foot Holywood, Dumfries		
	Dryden Fairbairn Fraser	Roxburghshire Lowlands Black Isle and Petty Parish		
	Kirkconnell McDonald	Kirkcudbrightshire Kiltarlity Parish Kirkhill, Engleshton Elgin		
	McGeorge McKenzie McKenzie McLean Nicholson Rae Ross	Kirkpatrick—Durham Black Isle Kiltarlity Petty Parish Aberdeenshire Kirkpatrick—Durham Tarbet Parish Petty Parish		
	Scott	Cavers Parish Roxburghshire		
	Taylor	Crossmichael P. Auchendolly Farm St Boswells		
	Thomson		Mrs George Downey Eskadale Farm Tiverton, Ontario Canada NOG 2TO	Private
	Thorburn	Roxburghshire		
Yes	Gettys (associated families)	Tweedsmure and P.A. U.S.A.	77 W. A. Gettys 122 Gettys Drive Gafney S.C. 29340	Private
Yes	McLew=Macfarlane =Kay	Balfron, Stirlingshire	78 Mrs Noeline Boyce 29 Flower Street Zone 5, NZ	Private

Whether willing to exchange information	Family Being Researched	County	Name and Address* Tel. No.	Non members private or professional
Yes	Morton=Marshall Watson=Nicholson McDonald=McHardy McKenzie=Steven Arthur=Bruce Chivas=Reid Shivas=Littlejohn Parlane=Macfarlane Anderson=Harper	Campsie, Stirlingshire (later) Monkton, Ayrshire Perth and Peebleshire Aberdeenshire Foulis Wester and Ardoch, Perthshire Dunblane Aberdeenshire Longside (Nether Savock) Aberdeenshire Old Deer Aberdeenshire Stuartfield Helensburgh Rhu		Private
Yes	Goodfellow Thomson	Roxburghshire Innerleithen	79 Miss Marjorie Goodfellow P.O. Box 1135 Sherbrooke, Quebec J1H 5L5	Private
Yes	Grant (before 1733)	Glenmoriston	80 Dr Guthrie Grant 35 Winchester Road Brooklin, Ontario Canada LOB 1CO	Private
Yes	Sinclair (Thos. Jas.)	Shetland Isles	81 Mrs Dianne Poore Warntune Cottage (Beginner) P.O. Box 1 TA1 TAPU Christchurch New Zealand	Private (Beginner)
Yes	Cameron Cook Fin(d)layson Kellan Luke MacAulay MacColl	Islay 1770; Greenock 1860 Ferry-Port-on Craig Fife 1600 on Paisley 1800 Berwickshire 1840 Berwickshire 1840 North Uist 1800 Islay 1770	82 Neil Cameron 17 Kennedy Street Glen Waverley Victoria 3150 Australia	Private

THE SCOTTISH GENEALOGY SOCIETY

CONSTITUTION

- 1 The objects of the Scottish Genealogy Society are:—
To promote research into Scottish Family History.
To undertake the collection, exchange and publication of information and material relating to Scottish Genealogy, by means of meetings, lectures, etc., etc.
- 2 The Society will consist of all duly elected Members whose subscriptions are fully paid. An *Honorary President* and up to four *Honorary Vice-Presidents* (who will be *ex officio* members of Council) may be elected at the Annual General Meeting.
- 3 The affairs of the Society shall be managed by a Council consisting of Chairman, Honorary Secretary, Honorary Treasurer, Honorary Editor, Honorary Librarian, *ex officio* Members, and not more than ten ordinary Members. A non-Council Member of the Society shall be appointed annually to audit the accounts.
- 4 Office-Bearers shall be elected annually. Three ordinary Members of Council shall retire annually by rotation, but shall be eligible for re-election. At meetings of the Council a quorum shall consist of not less than one-third of the Members. The Council may elect a Deputy Chairman.
- 5 An Annual General Meeting of the Society will be held on a date in November to be determined by the Council, at which reports will be submitted.
- 6 Members shall receive one copy of each issue of *The Scottish Genealogist*, but these shall not be supplied to those who are in arrears.
- 7 Institutions may be elected to affiliate membership of the Society. The subscription payable by such affiliate members shall be fixed from time to time by the Council. Affiliate members shall be entitled to receive 2 copies of each issue of the *Scottish Genealogist*, and to have suitable queries inserted therein free of charge. Their members shall be entitled to attend all meetings of the Society and to borrow books from the Society's Library (but not to send such books overseas). They shall not, however, have any vote at meetings of the Society, nor shall they be eligible for election to membership of the Council.
- 8 No alteration of this Constitution shall be made except at the Annual General Meeting of the Society, when a two-thirds majority will be required.

THE SCOTTISH GENEALOGY SOCIETY

Hon. President	The Right Hon. The Earl of Dundee, LL.D., Royal Banner Bearer of Scotland.
Hon. Vice-Presidents	Sir Iain Moncreiffe of that Ilk, Bart, Ph.D., Albany Herald. John F. Mitchell, C.I.E., F.S.A.Scot Duncan McNaughton, M.A., F.S.A.Scot
Chairman of Council	Donald Whyte, F.S.A.Scot, L.H.G
Hon. Secretary	Miss Joan P. S. Ferguson, M.A., A.L.A., 21 Howard Place, Edinburgh, EH3 5JY. (Tel.: 031-556-3844).
Hon. Treasurer	David C. Cargill, F.S.G., F.S.A.Scot., 20 Ravelston Garden, Edinburgh EH4 3LE.
Hon. Editor	Ivor R. Guild, M.A., LL.B., W.S., c/o Messrs Shepherd & Wedderburn, W.S., 16 Charlotte Square, Edinburgh, EH2 4YS.
Hon. Librarian	R. M. Strathdee, F.L.A., 89 Craigleith Road, Edinburgh, EH4 2EH.
Hon. Auditor	Peter A. Buncle.
Council	Miss Patricia M. Baxendine, M.A. Miss A. S. Cowper, B.A., F.L.A. George G. Halliday C. M. H. Millar R. W. Munro Mrs Sheila Pitcairn James R. Seaton, M.A. Mrs Rita E. Shiels Bruce A. Stenhouse. James A. Thompson.