

THE REPRESENTATION OF BUTE AND ROTHESAY IN PARLIAMENT.

By R. D. WHYTE.

(Read 18th December, 1917.)

As the County of Bute is likely soon to lose its right of returning a Member of Parliament it may be interesting to review the Parliamentary representation of Buteshire and its Royal Burgh—Rothesay.¹

As we have to go back to the days of the Scottish Parliament, let us look for a few minutes at the constitution of that Legislative Assembly.

"The real founder of the Scottish Parliament as a representative assembly," says Professor Rait, "was King Robert the Bruce."² In 1326 the King summoned a parliament to meet him at the Abbey of Cambuskenneth to settle the pecuniary relationship between him and the people, and to this parliament were called, in addition to the noblemen, "the burgesses and all other free tenants of the kingdom."³ The Lords Spiritual had before this attended the meetings of Great Council, for they were tenants holding directly of the Crown. All laymen who held their lands directly of the Crown were by right entitled to attend Parliament, but in practice only the great lords did so.

1. The Representation of the People Act, 1918, abolished Bute as a separate constituency. Bute was joined to North Ayr under the name of Bute and Northern Ayr. The new constituency includes the County of Bute and the County District of Northern Ayr, inclusive of all Burghs situated therein except the Burghs included in the Ayr District of Burghs. The first election under this Act took place in December, 1918.

2. "History of Scotland," by Prof. Rait (Home University Library) p. 226.

3. "The Scottish Parliament before the Union of the Crowns," Rait p. 27. Since this paper was read Professor Rait's invaluable book on The Parliaments of Scotland has been published.

Several attempts were made by Act of Parliament to ensure their attendance, but without avail, and it was not till 1585 that the County representation was put on a definite basis. In that year it was enacted that all freeholders of the King under the degree of prelates and Lords of Parliament who had forty shillings land in free tenandry of the King and their actual dwelling and residence within the same shire were to elect two wise men, being the King's freeholders, resident indwellers of the shire.¹ This qualification remained till the Reform Act of 1832.

While the Burgesses of Royal Burghs were called to the Parliament of 1326 it is not clear that they were regularly summoned to parliaments held from that date onwards. Professor Rait is of the opinion that from the end of the fourteenth century the burgesses took their places in parliament, but it is only from 1455 onwards that they are found in every parliament and on the regular Committees.² Each Royal Burgh had originally the right to send at least two members to Parliament,³ but it is doubtful if this power was taken advantage of. The Burgesses seem to have had no special desire to attend meetings of Parliament, and there were very few two member constituencies. In 1619 we find the Convention of Royal Burghs ordaining that one Commissioner should be sent from each Burgh, except Edinburgh, which had the right of sending two members,⁴ and this representation continued till the Union of Parliaments in 1707.

But even after the representation from Burgh and County had been put on a definite footing, neither the Burgesses nor the Barons of the Shire were regular attenders. Professor Terry⁵ states that of the Burghs represented before 1603, out of 52 recorded rolls Edinburgh comes first with 51 attendances. Thereafter the attendance of the representatives from the other Burghs decrease till we find at the bottom of the list Rothesay

1. "Scottish Parliament before the Union," Rait 25. "The Scottish Parliament," Terry 25.

2. "Scottish Parliament," Rait p. 30. But see more fully "The Parliaments of Scotland" by same author p. 238.

3. Rait *op cit* 32, Terry *op cit* 60.

4. Rait *op cit* p. 50, Terry p. 61.

5. *Op cit* p. 49.

with 26 and Dingwall with 21 attendances. The attendance of the Barons of the Shire was no better. On only three occasions after 1681 (when County representation in Scotland was complete for the first time), viz., in 1685, October 1700, and in 1705, were all the Counties represented. Out of fifty-one recorded rolls between 1603 and 1706 only two Counties—Haddington and Perth—appear at all. Bute appeared in thirty-four, while Kinross had the lowest attendance, viz., eleven.¹

It seems to me that the reasons of the poor attendances from Bute and Rothesay are not far to seek. The journey was long and tedious and withal expensive. Both Burgh and County were poor and could ill afford the luxury of a representative in Parliament. Moreover, the members had, until the last twenty years of its existence, very little say in the making of the laws. The work of a Parliament was delegated to a Committee known as the Lords of the Articles. The duty of the members of Parliament was, so far as they were free agents, to elect this Committee, and after an adjournment to witness the ratification of the legislation prepared by it. Professor Terry gives the following illustration of the method of procedure. He says: "The Parliament of 1617 met on 27th May and adjourned to 13th June. On 13th June the members were ordered to answer the roll daily until it should please the King to ride to the choosing of the Lords of the Articles. On 17th June the Committee was chosen, and until 28th June it met daily. On 28th June the King 'concluded' the parliament, and the whole mass of legislation prepared by the Articles was ratified in a single day."² It can hardly be wondered at that the eligible men of Bute and Rothesay were not, under all the circumstances, anxious to spend time and money in attending meetings of Parliament. The difference in the desire to serve in Parliament in older and modern times may be illustrated by two instances in which the elections were challenged. Sir Robert Montgomerie, Younger of Skelmorlie, was elected as representative for Bute to the Parliament of 1633. But he petitioned the Privy Council to rescind his commission on the ground that he was "neither ane baron nor freeholder of His Majestie in anie of his lands within

1. Terry 20 and 21.

2. Terry *op cit* p. 104.

the shirefdome, and so cannot be ane commissioner for the Parliament."¹ In 1880 Mr Thomas Russell of Ascog was returned to Parliament. But he was a member of a firm of Government Contractors and was unseated on petition. Nevertheless he and his former opponent—Mr Dalrymple—entered the field again, and on the second occasion Mr Dalrymple was returned.

The first recorded appearance of a Representative for Rothesay was in the last Parliament of James III. held in 1484. Rothesay was again represented in the first Parliament of James IV. held in 1488, but in neither case is the name of the representative given. From that time until (to quote Dr Hewison²) "in the troublous reign of James I. of England, meddling hands essayed to tamper with the settled form of Presbyterian worship," neither Rothesay nor Bute was represented.

When James VI. succeeded to the English Crown he promised to visit Scotland every three years, but it was fourteen years before he paid his first and only visit. A Parliament was summoned at which he presided.³ Bute was represented for the first time, the representatives being the Laird of Kames-Bannatyne and Paul Hamilton. Rothesay was not represented. Mathew Spens, the leading burgess of the time, had represented the Burgh at the Convention of Royal Burghs held in Dumbarton in July of that year, and had secured its exemption from attending further Conventions for the space of five years. The Councillors probably thought they had done quite enough for one year, and at any rate as much as they could afford.

The principal object of James' visit to Scotland was to complete the work of assimilating the Churches of the Kingdoms. From this point of view his visit was not a success. But he did not accept his defeat as final, and at the next sitting of Parliament, held in 1621, the Five Articles of Perth, by which James tried to introduce to the Church the custom of kneeling at Communion, the observance of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday, Episcopal Confirmation, private baptism in cases of necessity, and the private

1. "R.P.C." 2nd Series V. 45.

2. "Bute in the Olden Time"—II. 343.

3. Parliament of 1617. Reid "History of Bute," p. 200, says John Stewart, Sheriff of Bute, attended Parliament in 1579.

communion of the sick, were sanctioned by a majority of 89 to 59. At this Parliament Rothesay was represented by Mathew Spens and Bute by William Stewart of Kilchattan. Neither Bute nor Rothesay was represented at the Convention of 1625, but both constituencies were represented in the memorable Parliament of 1633. Although the Parliament of 1621 had sanctioned the Five Articles of Perth, the mass of the people could not be reconciled to the new order of things. Charles I. was, however, determined to make still further changes in Church and State. The King visited Scotland in 1633, and had taken steps to control the election of the Lords of the Articles. He was thus able to get his own way, and 168 bills were rushed through in ten days. Rothesay was again represented by Mathew Spens and the Freeholders of Bute by Hector Bannatyne of Kames and John Stewart of Ascog. None of these were supporters of the King, and when five years later the Scots banded themselves together to fight, if need be, for their liberty, the National Covenant was signed by Mathew Spens for the Burgesses of Rothesay and by Hector Bannatyne for the Freeholders of the County.¹ The Covenanters forced Charles to grant a Parliament which met from August till November, 1639. Mathew Spens and Bannatyne of Kames were again present as representing the Burgh and Shire. But the breach with the King was widening on both sides of the Border; negotiations ended in no final settlement, and three years later the Civil War had begun. Scotland threw in its lot with the English Parliamentary Party, and the Covenanters determined to hold a Convention of Estates to authorise their future proceedings. The Convention, which met on 22nd June, 1643, without warrant from the King, allied itself with the cause of the English Parliament and produced the famous Solemn League and Covenant. At this Convention Rothesay was represented by Provost John Jamieson, who three years afterwards was murdered by the Clan Campbell at Dunoon,² and Bute by Sir

1. "Bute in the Olden Time," Vol. II. p. 326. At the Meeting in Stirling in July 1638, the Convention of Burghs "Ratifies the Covenant; and statutes that none be admitted burgesses, commissioners, magistrates and councillors of Burghs, but these that has taken the Covenant." Records of Convention IV.—543.

2. "Bute in the Olden Time," II.—334.

Robert Montgomery of Skelmorlie. When the cause of Charles I. was lost and the King brought to the scaffold, the Scots Estates, in 1649, proclaimed his son as King with the title of Charles II. At this meeting Rothesay was represented by Donald McGilchrist, but no representative appeared for Bute. The Scottish rising in favour of the new King was of short duration. Cromwell was soon master of the country, and his victory interrupted, for a short time, the history of the Scottish Parliament.

Cromwell's policy was to have one Parliament for the United Kingdom. The number of members allocated to England was 400 and to Scotland 30. These representatives were elected by voters possessing a property qualification of £200 real or personal. Counties and Burghs were to be grouped. The Shires of Dumbarton, Argyll, and Bute were to return one member, the place of election to be Dumbarton. The Burghs of Lanark, Glasgow, Rutherglen, Rothesay, Renfrew, Ayr, Irvine, and Dumbarton were also to return one member, the place of election to be Glasgow. On 22nd July, 1654, the Glasgow Town Council appointed "ane proclamation to be sent throw the toun, on Tuesday nixt, to warne all the inhabitantes capable to give voyce in the election of a commissioner to the nixt parliament of England sould meet and convene in Hutchesons Hospitall, on Friday nixt, at ten houres for that effect."² The Burghs elected John Wilkie of Bromhouse, while the Counties chose Sir James Hamilton of Ormerton. In 1656 Capt. John Lockhart was returned for the Counties and George Talbot for the Burghs.³ In 1658 and 1659 Wm. Stane, M.D., represented the Counties, and Capt. John Lockhart the Burghs.

With the Restoration the Scottish Parliament resumed its sittings. At the first Parliament—known as the Drunken Parliament—Rothesay was represented by Adam Stewart, and Bute by Sir James Stewart of Kirktown. This Parliament was completely under the control of the King. It sat from 1st January till 1st July, and passed 393 Acts, including one which rescinded all its own statutes passed since 1640. It is unnecessary to deal

1. "Acts of Parliament of Scotland" VI., part ii., p. 823.

2. "Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Glasgow"—292.

3. Representatives from Rothesay were not always present, e.g., no representatives attended the 1656 election.

with the infrequent Parliaments which met during the reigns of Charles II. or James II. They really did not attempt to govern the country and only conveyed the official sanction to the Bills which they were ordered to pass. Professor Rait quotes the impression of a contemporary,¹ "They (i.e. the members) sit all in one House, and every one answers distinctly to his name and gives his vote which is in these terms: I approve or not; only those who are not satisfied one way or another say *non liquet*, which is a great ease to those who are conscientious, and a common refuge to the cunning politicians; the major vote carries it. No dissents or protests are allowed in public acts, but are accounted treasonable." But with the Revolution the Lords of the Articles were abolished, and Committees chosen in equal numbers from each Estate took their place, and Parliament was able to assert its power of initiation.

A Convention of Estates was summoned for 14th March, 1689—the election of the representatives from Burghs for this one election to be, not by the Town Council, but by the Burgesses themselves. The Burgesses of Rothesay met on 7th March when "ane hundredth fiveteen burgesses being present and thretty seven absent about yr lawfull affaires and oyrwayes, ane hundredth and twelve of the Burgesses present did by their voyces and sufrages nominat and elect Mr Robert Stewart, Uncle to the Shiref of Bute, Advocate, ther Commissioner for representing the sd. Burgh at the Convention, and two of the present Burgesses haveing nominate Cuthbert Stewart late provist of the sd. Burgh and ane of them haveing nominat Hector Bannatyne Younger of Kames to be Commissioner."

The County Freeholders met on 5th March when 14 attended—four being absent. Sir James Stewart and David Boyle were elected, the votes being for Sir James Stewart 8, for David Boyle 6, for Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie 2, for John Stewart of Ascog 1, and for Archibald Stewart of Kilwhinleck 1.

These two elections deserve more than a passing notice. Cuthbert Stewart had been Rothesay's representative since 1681, but he only received two votes. Now when Major David Ramsay, who had in "ane arbitrary and despotick way" been appointed provost by the Privy Council he, on 28th June, 1687,

1. Rait—"History of Parliament." 107.

summoned a meeting of the Town Council. Only about one-third of the Council attended, Cuthbert Stewart being amongst those who refused to obey the summons. If he would not obey the King's Provost it was hardly likely that he would be favourable to the King's cause, while the electors of both Bute and Rothesay, following Sir James Stewart, were predominately Royalist in their sympathies. While only three Covenanters appear amongst the Rothesay voters, it may be that the "thretty seven absent about yr lawful affaires and oyrwayes" had Covenanting sympathies but thought better not to express them. The County Freeholders divided their votes, putting the Royalist Sir James Stewart first, and David Boyle, whose sympathies were with the revolutionary party, second.

All three Representatives appear on the Roll of the Convention which met on 14th March. But neither Sir James nor Robert Stewart signed the Act declaring the Convention to be a free and lawful meeting of the Estates, nor the letters to the King of England. And when, on 5th June, the Convention was turned into a Parliament, both Robert Stewart and his nephew refused to attend. This refusal led to awkward consequences. Sir James was to be carried as a "prisoner to the Tolbooth of Edinburgh and to be kept a close prisoner therein." His servant, Francis Brodie, was also arrested, but Sir James was allowed a servant "he allwayes remaining constantlie in the room with his master."¹ On the petition of Lady Bute the Estates somewhat relaxed their stringent orders and allowed Sir James "the libertie of a free prison."² Finally, Robert Stewart was fined £200 Scots and Sir James £600 Scots and their seats declared vacant.³ William Stewart of Ambrismore was elected in room of Sir James Stewart, but the Town Council of Rothesay took a peculiar course. Instead of electing a representative, they thought proper to subscribe a blank Commission and to send it to Robert Stewart, their late member, so that he might fill in a "a fitt persones name who will represent the burgh and be most effectual for the good of the tounce." The name filled in was that of Robert Stewart of

1. A.P.S. IX. app. p. 16.

2. A.P.S. IX. app. 26.

3. A.P.S. IX.—249. Both afterwards changed their minds.

Lochlie, writer in Edinburgh. The new members took their seats on 23rd May, 1693,¹ during the fourth session of the Parliament.

David Boyle was raised to the peerage in 1700, and a new election was ordered for Bute. I have not been able to trace any taking place, and no new name appears in the Parliamentary Rolls.

Queen Anne ascended the Throne on 20th February, 1702, but a new election of Parliament did not take place till October of that year—the first election since 1689, and the last election for a Scottish Parliament which was to be held. Rothesay elected Dougald Stewart of Blairhall. At the County Election 8 freeholders attended, but John Stewart of Ascog challenged the right of two of them to vote on the ground of their not being infeft, or being “parchment barons,” that is nominal freeholders to whom land was given in trust only in order that they might possess the right of voting. The objections were repelled. But Ascog was not easily put down. The Minute goes on—

“ Their being a motion made be Ascog that whoever should be commissioner should serve gratis which is repelled be the baill heritors, except he himself who adheres thereto in respect of the poverty of the shyre. And after having sworn the alledgeance they have made choyce of Sir James Stewart of Bute, and Mr Robt. Stewart of Tillicoultry, one of the senators of the colledge of justice, to be commissioners, except Ascog, who votts Sir James Stewart and himself, and they ordain a commission to be subscribed to the said Sir James Stewart and Mr Robert Stewart. And Ascog moves that Mr Robert should not be elected, by reason that he is not infeft in a forty shilling land in the shyre undenuded, which motion the heritors does reject by reason they fynd him infeft in severale lands, and whether he be denuded or not they know not, and therefore they elect, and this objection was made after the election was over.”

From 1567 to the Union of 1707 the Representatives of Shires were entitled to be paid for their Parliamentary services. In 1641 it was finally fixed that each Commissioner should receive

1. A.P.S. IX.—264.

£5 Scots per day during his attendance in Parliament and for the time occupied going and returning therefrom—in the case of Bute 6 days being so allowed.¹ But it is doubtful how far this expense had actually been paid. We find Kelburne and Kames craving from the Shire the sum of £920 Scots (£76 13s 4d Sterling) “as their commissioners’ fees for attending ye last Convention of Estates holden at Edinburgh the day of 167(8) yeirs, continuing seventeen dayes, with six dayes comeing and goeing and their attendance att the last parliament holden be his Royal Highness as Commissioners the 28th day of July, 1681, continuing 63 days with six dayes comeing att ten pund (16/8d) per diem.”

The Burgh’s Representatives were also entitled to payment, and had trouble in getting their fees. For example, the town was only able to pay John Stewart of Ascog one-half of his fees for attending the Parliament of 1669, and they settled the other half by giving Stewart a receipt for compensation money due by him on his infeftment to certain lands. In 1694 and 1700 Robert Stewart asked for his fees for attending Parliament, but “considering the poverty of the toune is in for tyme cannot spare soe much as is desyred,” so they imposed an assessment to give him part payment.² In 1652 Rothesay and six other Burghs were excused from sending Deputies to Edinburgh to treat with the English Commissioners with reference to the Union of Parliaments on the ground of poverty, “which hath usually excused them from sending to Parliament.”³

Several of the Counties⁴ were making an attempt to get rid of this payment, and Ascog apparently wanted Bute to fall into line with these Counties, and although he was defeated the tendency was towards the discontinuance of this payment, and the Estates resolved not to pay the Commissioners to the United Parliament.

1. For details regarding payment see Terry *op cit* 44.

2. On 9th February, 1655, the Convention of Burghs being informed that Glasgow had advanced to John Wilkie, the Commissioner appointed to represent the joint Burghs in the Commonwealth Parliament in London the sum of £1404 Scots, apportioned this sum amongst the Burghs and ordered payment. Rothesay’s share was £39 6s. “Records of Convention III.”—397.

3. Acts Par. Scot. VII.—II. 776.

4. e.g. Aberdeen. Terry *op cit* 45.

As Ascog was anxious to represent the County in Parliament, it may be doubted whether his sole desire was to save the County the Commissioner's fees. For the new Parliament was to be called on to consider a momentous question, viz., its own extinction. Before the Parliament rose in 1702 it requested the Queen to appoint Commissioners to consider a Union. This attempt failed, but the new Parliament knew full well that it would have again to consider the question. The new Parliament was, in the words of Professor Hume Brown,¹ "the most aggressively patriotic of all Scottish Parliaments," and as a counter declaration to the Act of Settlement of the English Parliament passed the Act of Security, by which the Estates, twenty days after the death of the reigning sovereign without issue, were to name a successor, who must not be the person designated by the Parliament of England unless under conditions that secured to Scotland complete freedom of government, of religion, and of trade. The English Parliament retaliated by passing an Act which provided that "unless the Crown of Scotland were settled by Christmas Day of 1705 all Scotsmen would henceforth be held as aliens, and all importation of Scotch cattle, sheep, coals and linen be prohibited."² By the same Act the Queen was empowered to appoint Commissioners to negotiate a union of the Parliaments of the two countries. A measure was introduced into the Scottish Parliament empowering the Queen to nominate Scottish Commissioners to negotiate a union. A section of the House, led by the Duke of Atholl, opposed this measure, and he was supported by, amongst others, Dugald Stewart, the Member for Rothesay.³ But the House contented itself with an address to the Queen praying that the objectionable Act should be repealed as a necessary condition for the successful issue of the negotiations. Commissioners were accordingly, on 27th February, 1706, appointed, one of them being Robert Stewart of Tillicoultry, one of the Members for Bute. The other Member for Bute was now John Stewart of Kilwhinleck, *vice* Sir James Stewart, who was created an

1. "History of Scotland" III. 86.

2. Hume Brown *op cit* III. 44.

3. Acts of Par. Scot. XI. 236. Mr Stewart had been appointed one of the Auditors of Accounts, XI. 77, and a member of the Council of Trade, *ibid.* 222.

Earl on 6th July, 1704. When the Scottish Parliament came to discuss the Articles of Union Robert Stewart uniformly supported them while Dugald Stewart generally opposed, and when the Act of Union came for final approval Robert Stewart voted for it—neither Dugald Stewart nor James Stewart being on the list of voters.¹ By the Act of Union Buteshire was linked with Caithness-shire each County electing a member alternately.² The Burghs were grouped together—Ayr, Irvine, Rothesay, Campbeltown, and Inveraray forming one constituency.

The franchise in the Shires was limited to forty shilling freeholders or possessors of a freehold of £400 Scots of valued rent according to the general survey of Cromwell. The Town Councils still elected the members for the Burghs. Each Burgh became a returning Burgh in rotation, and one delegate from each of the other Burghs attended and carried through the election. The first County Election was for Bute in 1708, when Dugald Stewart, the former Member for Rothesay, was elected. He was "promoted to a lucrative office," viz., a Judgeship in the Court of Session, and on 28th February, 1709, John Montgomery of Ballochmartin was elected in his stead. Thereafter the elections went on alternately without any excitement. The roll of electors was small. From 1762 to 1830 the highest number was 21 in 1830, the lowest 8 in 1762. But very few electors took the trouble of attending the elections—these varied from one (Lord Bannatyne) in 1806 to 7 in 1830.⁴

In the case of the Burghs, Ayr was the returning Burgh in 1708—Rothesay's turn coming in 1713, when the Provosts of Inveraray and Campbeltown attended and the former member, Dr Oliphant, was re-elected.⁵ But these elections were very

1. Acts Par. Scot. XI.

2. Caithness protested against being joined with Bute. Acts Par. Scot. XI. 420.

3. M.S. Minutes of Commissioners of Supply.

4. The figures are:—

	On Roll.	Present		On Roll.	Present.
7 June 1762	8	4	13 Nov. 1806	10	1
8 Nov. 1774	15	6	7 Nov. 1812	18	3
22 April 1784	12	4	1 April 1820	14	2
27 June 1796	10	3	21 Aug. 1830	21	7

In 1832 the electors numbered 279.

5. As to expenses regarding elections see Transactions of this Society—IV. 58.

formal affairs, and we find on 12th September, 1780, the Factor for Lord Bute—Mr Peter May—wrote to John Blain to the effect that he (Mr May) had a letter from Mr Oliphant of Rossie advising that the Lord Privy Seal had written that it had been agreed between the Duke of Argyll and the Earl of Bute that the Duke was to name the member for the Burghs of which Rothesay is a part, so that the Council has only to approve of the member pointed out by the Duke.

But two years later the question of Parliamentary Reform was raised. Burgh Reform in Scotland preceded the demand for Parliamentary Reform. The question was first raised in 1782, and it has already been shown how six years later this Burgh was agitated over the question.¹ The French Revolution retarded the agitation, and finally Parliamentary Reform preceded by a year Burghal Reform. By the Reform Bill of 1832, eight members were added to the Scottish representation, bringing the number up to 53. Seats were redistributed, and the County of Bute, including Rothesay, formed one constituency. The franchise was altered, and the "parchment Barons," of whom Ascog had complained, were abolished. The first Elections in 1832 were keenly contested throughout the country, but Bute was an exception, for Capt. Charles Stuart was returned unopposed.² There was no contested election till 1841, when Sir William Rae, who had been member in the 1830-31 Parliament and since 1833, was unsuccessfully opposed by Mr Henry Dunlop on the non-intrusion question. The election then lasted over two days, but Mr Dunlop gave up the contest on the first day (Votes: Rae 138, Dunlop 82). From Sir William Rae's death in 1842 till the General Election in 1859 the seat was held without opposition by the Hon. James A. Stuart Wortley, who successively held the posts of Judge Advocate-General and Solicitor-General for England. He was a candidate for the Speakership of the House of Commons, and wishing to represent a large constituency, should he

1. See Transactions of this Society, Vol. III., p. 39.

2. Members returned :—

Counties, 22 Whigs, 8 Tories.

Burghs, 22 Whigs, 1 Tory.

Probably the Rothesay electors were too much concerned with their Town Council Election for there were 66 candidates out of 202 electors. See Transaction of this Society, Vol. 10.

be elected to that office, he forsook his friends in Bute to contest—unsuccessfully as it turned out—the West Riding of Yorkshire. Mr David Mure, Lord Advocate, came forward as Conservative candidate, and was opposed by Mr James Lamont of Knockdow. The election was keenly contested. It was the days of open voting, and the votes recorded for each candidate were very close. In consequence "the excitement was immense, great crowds moved about the streets, rushing at one time to the Committee Rooms to hear the *status quo*, and at another pursuing some voter, and cheering or hissing according to his colours." At four o'clock there was a majority of 15 in Bute and Cumbræ for Mr Lamont, but the Arran electors, 24 in number, voted to a man for Mr Mure, who accordingly was elected by a majority of 9. Early in 1865 Mr Mure was raised to the Bench and a bye-election took place—the candidates being Hon. Geo. Frederick Boyle and Mr Lamont. This was the keenest and surely the most curious election ever fought in Bute. Politics were hardly ever mentioned. The political views of the candidates were apparently of little interest to the electors—the question that counted was their religious views. "Mr Boyle has committed the unpardonable sin of founding an Episcopal seat of learning at Millport; therefore, according to Buteshire logic, Mr Boyle must be a red-hot Papist in disguise," while "Mr Lamont once, in those icy regions where the sun does not distinguish day from night or day from day, shot a seal on Sunday without knowing it *was* Sunday; therefore he is in favour of abolishing the Sabbath. Moreover, he is a friend of Mr Darwin's and has read Mr Darwin's book, *ergo* according to the same convincing logic, he must be an infidel."¹ There was the usual election excitement on the day of the poll. All the cabs in Rothesay had been engaged for some days previous by the rival candidates to convey electors to the poll. One voter was carried by four men on a sofa bed and attended by a doctor in order to record his vote. Another was seized by his creditors while on his way to vote and was carried off to prison—for the day at least. The result of the poll showed a majority

1. *Glasgow Herald*, 25th January, 1865.

The voting places were Rothesay, Millport and Inverclyde.

of 15 for Mr Boyle. Bute gave a majority of 50 for Mr Lamont, Cumbræ a majority of 65 for Mr Boyle, while the votes in Arran were cast equally for the two candidates.

At the previous Election some youths had made a disturbance in Rothesay after the declaration of the poll, and anticipating something similar the authorities drafted in extra police. Notwithstanding there was considerable disturbance on the night of the poll, which continued after the extra police had left the town, and some damage was done. As a result 12 persons were charged before the Sheriff—some with assault and breach of the peace, others for breaking windows. Fines varying in amount were imposed; the Town Council paid £18 16s 2d for damage done, and thus ended the most exciting of our Elections.

A General Election took place in July of the same year. Mr Boyle was again opposed by Mr Lamont. Again the religious views of the candidates were canvassed, and theological discussions predominated. The result was that Mr Lamont was elected by a majority of 11, and while there was considerable excitement there was a complete absence of the scenes which have made the former elections so memorable.

Since 1865 the Elections have been fought on party lines—the only outstanding feature being the Election of 1880, already alluded to, when Mr Thomas Russell of Ascog was returned. The Instrument of Dissolution of Partnership had been prepared, but by an oversight had not been signed, and a petition was presented against his return. He admitted that as a member of a firm of Government Contractors he could not sit, and the Election was declared void. At the Election which took place in July Mr Dalrymple was returned. It is unnecessary to refer to the other Elections.

The list appended gives the names of all the Members, so far as I have been able to trace them.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

I.—FROM REIGN OF JAMES III. TO THAT OF CHARLES I.

	Buteshire.	Rothesay.
1484	Not represented	Representative not named
1488	Do.	Representative not named
1617	The Laird of Camyis-Bannatyne Paul Hamilton	Absent
1621	William Stewart of Kilehatten	Mathew Spens (Provost 1634 or probably from 1628 till 1841)
1633	Hector Bannatyne Yr. of Kames John Stewart of Ethok (Ascog)	Mathew Spens
1639	Bannatyne of Kames	Mathew Spens
1643	Sir Robert Montgomery of Skel-	John Jamieson
{ Convention morlie		(Provost 1642-46)
1644-46		
1644	¹ Sir James Stewart, Sheriff of Bute	Absent
1645	Sir James Stewart	Absent
1646	Absent	John McGilchrist (Provost 1655-8 and 1660-1)
1648-51		
1648	Ninian Stewart, Laird of Kilehatten	Absent
	Hector Bannatyne of Kames	
1649	Absent	Donald McGilchrist
1651	The Laird of Ascog	

II.—CROMWELL'S UNITED PARLIAMENT.

	Bute, Dumbarton and Argyll	Rothesay, Glasgow, Lanark, Rutherglen, Renfrew, Ayr, Irvine and Dumbarton
1654	Sir James Hamilton of Ormiston	John Wilkie of Bromhouse
1658	Capt. John Lockhart	George Talbot
1658	William Stane, M.D., (made his election for Thetford in Nor- folk)	Capt. John Lockhart
1659	William Stane	Capt. John Lockhart

III.—FROM THE RESTORATION TILL THE UNION OF PARLIAMENTS.

	Buteshire.	Rothesay.
1661-3		
1661	¹ Sir James Stewart of Kirktown	Adam Stewart
1662	Do.	Absent
1663	Absent	Absent
1665	² Sir Dougall Stewart of Bute	Absent
{ Convention		

	Buteshire.	Rothsay.
(1667	Ninian Bannatyne	Absent
(Convention		
1669-73		
1669	² Sir Dougall Stewart of Bute Ninian Bannatyne of Kames	John Stewart of Ascog
1670	Both present	Do.
1672	Ninian Bannatyne	Do.
1673	Ninian Bannatyne	Do.
1678	³ John Boyle of Kelburn	⁴ Robert Stewart
(Convention Ninian Bannatyne of Kames		
(1681	³ John Boyle of Kelburn Ninian Bannatyne of Kames	Cuthbert Stewart (Provost 1671-8 and 1684-5)
1685-6		
1685	⁵ Sir James Stewart of Bute	Cuthbert Stewart
1689	⁵ Sir James Stewart of Bute	⁴ Robert Stewart
(Convention ⁶ David Boyle of Kelburne		
(1689-1702		
1689	David Boyle of Kelburne	Absent
1690	David Boyle	Absent
1693	David Boyle	Robert Stewart of Lochlie
	William Stewart of Ambrismore	
1695	David Boyle	Do.
	William Stewart	
1696	David Boyle	Do.
1698	David Boyle	Robert Stewart
	William Stewart	
1700	William Stewart	Do.
1700	Do.	Do.
1702	Do.	Absent
1703-7		
1703	⁵ Sir James Stewart of Bute Robert Stewart of Tillicoultry	⁷ Dougall Stewart of Blairhall
1704	Robert Stewart	Do.
	John Stewart of Kilwhinleck	
1705	Robert Stewart	Do.
	John Stewart	
1706	Robert Stewart	Do.
	John Stewart	

IV.—UNITED PARLIAMENT FROM UNION TILL REFORM BILL.

	Bute and Caithness alternately	Rothsay, Ayr, Irvine, Camp- beltown and Inveraray
708-10	⁷ Dugald Stewart of Chapelton and Blairhall appointed Lord of Session in 1709 when	James Campbell
1709*-10	John Montgomerie of Balloch- martin elected	—
1710-13	(C) Sir James Dunbar of Hempt- riggs	Charles Oliphant, M.D.
1713-15	Col. John Campbell of South Garachtie	Do.
1715-22	(C) Sir Robert Gordon, Bart., of Gordonstown	Charles Oliphant, M.D., died Dec., 1719, when Thomas Kennedy elected
1722-27	Col. Peter Campbell of South Garachtie	⁸ William Stewart

	Bute and Caithness alternately	Rothsay, Ayr, Irvine, Camp- beltown and Inveraray
1727-34	(C) Patrick Dunbar of Bower- madden	⁸ William Stewart
1734-41	Col. Peter Campbell of South Garachtie	Col. James Stewart of Torrance
1741-47	(C) Alex. Brodie of Brodie	George Earl of Granard (Irish Peer)
1747-54	James Stewart Mackenzie of Rosehaugh	Charles Erskine died 1749 when
1749*		⁹ Sir Henry Erskine elected
1754-61	(C) John Scott	James Stewart Mackenzie of Rosehaugh
1761-69	Lieut.-Col. James Stewart of Kermoran died and	Frederick Campbell made his election for Glasgow and
		¹⁰ Alexander Wedderburn elect- ed
1762*	Henry Wauchope of Kildavannan elected	
1769-74	(C) Viscount Portrose	^{10a} Hon. James Stuart of Ard- maliesh
1774-80	^{10a} Hon. James Stuart of Ardmaleish second son of John 3rd of Bute	Sir George Macartney, K.C.B., appointed Governor of Canada 1775 when
1775*		Hon. Fred Stuart elected, 3rd son of 3rd Earl of Bute
1780-84	(C) John Sinclair of Ulbster	Sir Archd. Edmonstone of Dun- breath
1784-90	^{10a} Lieut.-Col. James Stuart of Ard- maleish	Do.
1790-98	(C) Sir John Sinclair of Ulbster, Bart.	Col. Hon. Chas. Stuart resigned May, 1794, when
1794*		John Campbell elected (A master in Chancery)
1796-1802	Hon. Frederick Stuart of Kirk- ton (3rd son of 3rd Earl of Bute)	Do.
1802-6	(C) Sir John Sinclair, Bart.	Do.
1806-7	^{10a} Hon. James Stuart Wortley Mackenzie of Rosehaugh and Ardmaleish	Do.
1807-12	(C) Sir John Sinclair, Bart., ap- pointed Receiver General of Taxes in Scotland 1811 and	Col. John Campbell, Jr., of Shawfield, died 1809 when Duncan Campbell of Loch- nell elected
1809*		
1811*-12	(C) George Sinclair, Jr., of Ulbster	Duncan Campbell of Lochnell
1812-18	John Marjoribanks, Jr., of Lees	¹¹ Thos. F. Kennedy Jr., of Dunure
1818-20	(C) George Sinclair, Jr., of Ulbster	
1820-26	¹² Hon. Patrick James Grichton Stuart	Do.
1826-30	(C) Hon. James Sinclair of Brac- langwell	Do.
1830-31	¹³ Right Hon. Sir Wm. Rae, Bart.,	Thos. F. Kennedy, Jr., of Dunure
1831-32	(C) George Sinclair of Ulbster (C) Returned by Caithness.	Do.

V.—UNITED PARLIAMENT FROM REFORM BILL TO PRESENT TIME.

Buteshire.

1832-33	¹⁴ Capt. Charles Stuart, 1st Irish Guards
1833-42*	Right Hon. Sir William Rae, Bart.
1842-59*	¹⁵ Hon. James A. Stuart Wortley
1859-65	¹⁶ David Mure
1865*	¹⁷ Hon. George Frederick Boyle
1865-68	¹⁸ James Lamont of Knockdow
1868-85	¹⁹ Charles Dalrymple of New Hailes
1885-91	²⁰ Right Hon. J. P. B. Robertson
1891-1905	²¹ Right Hon. A. Graham Murray
1905-10*	Norman Lamont of Knockdow
1910-18	Harry Hope

* Bye-election.

NOTES ON MEMBERS.

1. Sir James Stewart of Kirkcubbin—created a Baronet of Nova Scotia by Charles I., 28th March, 1627. Adhered to King's Party during Civil War. Fined 5000 marks by Parliament in 1646. His estates afterwards sequestered but was graciously received by King after Restoration. Died 1662 and buried in Westminster Abbey. *Reid History of Bute* 202, *Blain History of Bute* 234. There is no Commission extant in favour of James Stewart. There is one in favour of Dougall Stewart of Kirkcubbin, but his name does not appear in the Record of Parliament.
2. Sir Dougald Stewart, son of Sir James Stewart and father of first Earl of Bute, was Provost of Rothesay 1664-71.
3. "John Boyle of Kelburne greatly increased the fortunes of the family by successful adventure, and was one of the owners of the frigate 'George of Glasgow,' fitted out in that city as a privateer in 1665." *Reid* 232.
4. Robert Stewart, brother of Sir Dougall Stewart and uncle of Sir James Stewart—afterwards Sir Robert Stewart of Tillycoultry—one of the Senators of the College of Justice and one of the Commissioners for the Union of 1707. His name, however, does not appear in the sederunt of the meeting of Commissioners which took place in London. Created a Baronet by Queen Anne 1707.
5. Sir James Stewart afterwards concurred in the Revolution, as James II. had abandoned constitutional principles, and transferred his allegiance to William and Mary. On 14th April, 1703, was created Earl of Bute. In 1706 dissented from Union of Parliaments and retired to his country seat. *Reid* 204.
6. David Boyle of Kelburn. Strenuous supporter of Protestant succession. In reward for his services raised to peerage. On 31st January, 1699, created Lord Boyle of Kelburn, and on 12th April, 1703, Earl of Glasgow. *Reid* 232. On Boyle being raised to the Peerage a warrant was granted for a new election to be held on 6th June following, but no election took place.
7. Dugald Stewart of Blairhall, son of Sir Dougald Stewart. Voted against Union. At General Election of 1708 he was chosen representative for Perth and Bute, and sat for both till he was appointed a Lord of Session in 1709, with the title of Lord Blairhall, succeeding his uncle Lord Tillycoultry. *Reid* 203.
8. William Stewart Secretary to H.R.H. Prince of Wales.