

Warrant  
Dat.

presumptive ground of confiscation <sup>which</sup> ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> not allowed to prove the contrary. But those engaged in War are allowed to show the  
 presumption lying against them from false or cross documents by a contrary positive proof  
 of the true owners. Because the latter cannot safely trade without colourable documents;  
 whereas neutrals being free to trade with both parties are under no necessity to contrive  
 such documents. 14 November 1673 Mr of the Liberdoy contra Middleton 13 November 1673  
 Clerk contra Smolton. But two papers from the same Government varying in some  
 things not material were not found to make the ship prize; 13 June 1673 Windox  
 contra owners of the St Andrew. And when the ships of neutrals have counterband goods  
 aboard, or double or colourable documents to cover them will not infer confiscation  
 if it be proved, that these goods belong to friends, nor are not directed to an enemies  
 port: because in such cases neutrals are forced to use colourable documents. But  
 those being under no necessity to use such shifts to instruct the property of the  
 ship or other goods therein not counterband, contrary proofs not recorded to take  
 off the ordinary presumption arising from want of documents, or from forging or  
 using or destroying them, or using double documents. Star ibid. § 26. The having  
 aboard double flags to be made use of on divers occasions, imports that the ship  
 or loading or some part thereof belongs to enemies, Star ibid. § 20. 3<sup>o</sup> Destroying  
 papers or documents or throwing <sup>them</sup> overboard at the time of the capture, is a  
 most pregnant ground of confiscation; it being thence presumed, that these papers  
 would have instructed the enemies right to the ship or goods which is presumptio  
 juris et de jure; Star Inst Lib. 2 Tit. 2 § 23. That fact of throwing overboard the  
 sworn by one witness only, joined to the masters acknowledging upon oath that he  
 had not made fault as the papers bore; was sustained relevant to declare a ship  
 prize 9 July 1673 Gillies contra owners of the bounds. And the oath of one  
 witness that papers were thrown overboard, subjects to the burden of proving  
 that the ship and loading belong'd to the enemy 28 February 1673 Mr of the  
 white Dove qua Alexander. 4<sup>o</sup> Ships have oft times been declared prize  
 upon a concurrence of several evidences of a contraband <sup>under</sup> colourable docu-  
 = ments: As when a pass did not mention the port the ship was directed to, which  
 a Toll Broke bore to Brome, and the Master acknowledged upon oath to be from  
 = Jordan, and edarqued the body of the pass as to the place of his own Residence,  
 and the names of the owners, against whose oath a contrary proof was not admitted  
 23 January 1673 The owners the Crown of Dantzick contra Lynn. A Ship was  
 confiscated because instructed with a pass which the skipper acknowledged had been obtained for  
 another ship, and both he and the steward deposed, that they knew not to whom the goods  
 belong'd having orders from a Merchant in Amsterdam to consign them in the pack House  
 of Stockholm to be delivered to persons bringing furs to the city 10 July 1673 Traror contra  
 Mr of the Flying Hart a Swedish ships Cargo of Counterband Goods was declared prize. In  
 respect 1<sup>o</sup> It was declared upon oath that Samuel Sutton Englishman residing in  
 Sweden had bargained with the Tar company in Stockholm, that if the loading came  
 safe to Scotland or England it should belong to him, and if taken by the Hollanders then  
 in war with Britain should belong to the Tar company. 2<sup>o</sup> There were papers  
 thrown overboard the time of capture. 3<sup>o</sup> The ship was insured at Amsterdam  
 which was an <sup>in</sup> minute of an unwarrantable contraband 22 July 1673 Captain  
 contra Maglor of the Fortino of Trailland. But Insurance by the enemy of ship  
 and goods is not per se a sufficient ground of confiscation, Star ibid. § 17 July 1673  
 Master of the Golden Falcon contra Buchanan. Because that doth not change the  
 property, and stals in the Insuror, but is only a personal obligation in him to  
 make

makes up the loss of the property by sea hazard, or otherwise in the name of the Insuror. <sup>or</sup>  
 Neither was it found a just ground to confiscate a ship or loading, that the same belonged to  
 the subjects of a prince holding his estate of the Kings Navy, unless he had contributed to  
 the war, 7 January 1667 L Ludquharn contra Deaton. Nor was a ship in possession of  
 a goods adjudged prize, for being bought in the enemies country, and taken at sea before  
 she touched any other ground, albeit there was no writ aboard to instruct the goods; In  
 respect ships may be alienated by verbal bargains and possession, from the property  
 of ships, as of other movables is presumed 26 July 1673 Humdon contra Master of  
 the of Stalin. 21 February 1673 owners of the revenue of East Trizeland contra  
 Binning. If adjudication of prizes by the Admirals be after they were made and sold  
 reduced by the Lords, the owners of the vessel are liable in part for the  
 whole price; and not each several one for his share ascribed in June 1680 the  
 Anna of Christiana contra Merton, when the ship was seized on sufficient grounds  
 of suspicion 9 February 1675 Praris contra Martin de la. In the being  
 furnished and set out the vessel, was a vessel or a vessel or a vessel or a vessel  
 for the purpose of a prize ship. And the captain had his commission from the Admirals  
 caution ad majoram cautelam, nothing hindering him his command and the owners to be  
 liable in the prize, and to restore the ship and loading which is factum in dubio. Now  
 as these persons so obliged could not free themselves by offering a part of the ship and  
 loading; neither can they do it by offering a part of the price, which is siro galum in  
 places thereof. For if it were otherwise, strangers need not bother to reclaim ships  
 unjustly adjudged to be prize, because they could not know all the owners, and if any  
 of them were insolvent could not recover their share. Therefore the owners ought  
 rather to seek relief among themselves, and fitly impudent that they ought in part  
 = nor ship with insolvent owners. But if the ship and loading be orderly captured  
 by the Admirals warrant, or sold by his descent before the same be questioned in  
 a Reduction, and the Lords find that the ship and loading are prize and ought not to  
 be made prize, they decree the owners of the prize to pay only the price got  
 at the Roup or sold bona fide; by the Admirals warrant or descent. Star Inst.  
 Lib. 2 Tit. 2 § 26. Thus a privateer clothed with the Kings Commission to make  
 prize of all ships carrying goods to the Danes, having executed the same against  
 a ship of Hamburg before proclaiming of the war, was found to have acted bona  
 fide, and liable only to restore what profit he made of the ship and goods taken;  
 unless he had been in culpa by spoiling or misapprehending thereof 25 February 1668  
 Merchants of Hamburg contra Distington. Again, the Admirals having adjudged a  
 ship and goods prize as belonging to the enemy, and the descent being reduced  
 by the Lords, as to a parcel of these goods belonging to a London Merchant, who had  
 been ignorant of the enemies Interest: The Lords found the privateer who had seized  
 that parcel by virtue of the descent of adjudication before he was summoned in the  
 Reduction liable only for the price ascribed 13 December 1673 Clerk contra  
 Smolton. Where a descent of the Admirals adjudging a prize taken upon probable  
 grounds was reduced after the goods were sold, and a fifth part paid to the King and  
 a fourth to the Admiral; The Captain and owners of the prize were got no allowance  
 of the said fifth and fourth parts: Without prejudice to them to seek Reduction  
 thereof 24 February 1668 Master contra Strangers of Ostend. But in a like  
 case the Lords allowed Reduction to the privateer of the fifth and fourth parts,  
 which he had paid by virtue of a standing descent for the time before his action  
 against the Admiral for the prize, and application to the Exchequer for the other:  
 upon which application the fifth part was repaid, and by action the fourth  
 was