(Due ex pado.)

1662. December 11.

GEORGE LOGGIE against PETER LOGGIE.

George Loggie having borrowed 800 merks from Peter Loggie, his brother, gave a wadfet therefor. The faid George being an old man, without hope of children, the reversion was only granted to George, and the heirs of his own body, and his liferent of the wadfet lands was reserved, without mentioning of any back-tack duty, or annualrent. George having used an order and configned the 800 merks, obtained declarator.—Peter suspends, and alleges no redemption ought to have been, till the annualrent were configned with the principal.—The charger answered, That the contract of wadset bore no annualrent.—The suspender replied, That albeit it did not, yet he having lent his money in these terms, in hopes of succession, and his brother having now married a young wife, he ought not to take advantage of him, seeing the annualrent is due, in equity, for the profit of the money.

THE LORDS, in respect of the tenor of the contract of wadset, found the letters orderly proceeded, without any annualrent, and that in this case it could not be due, without it had been so pactioned and agreed.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 38. Stair, v. 1. p. 149.

1699. July 12. Mr Alexander Carnegy against Kinfauns.

In the contract of marriage between Mr Alexander Carnegy, second fon to the Earl of Notherk, and Anna Blair, heirers of Kinfauns, his father engages for L. 40,000 of patrimony with his fon. Kinfauns dispones his estate to his daughter, and the heir-male of the marriage, with this quality, that if Alexander furvive and enter into a fecond marriage, it shall be lawful for him to burden the estate of Kinfauns with 20,000 merks in favours of a second wife, and the heirs of that marriage; which case existed, and the said 20,000 merks being affected by his relict and her fon, it was first debated, that the faculty was extinct, never being specifically exerced; this the Lords repelled 23d June 1698 *, and found the entering into a fecond marriage a fufficient exercise and equipol-Then Crawfurd of Monorgan, Alexander Peter, the Earl of Northesk, and other creditors of the father's, craved preference to the son, because this being in bonis of their debtor, was both affectable, and actually affected by them, and he could have discharged it in whole or in part; and so being fiar, his son can have it in no other way but as heir to him, and must, eo nomine, be subject to their debts, and they preferred quoad this interest.—Replied, This faculty was never purchased nor acquired by their debtor's means, but was given in contemplation of the L. 40,000 the Earl of Northesk, his father, contracted with him, and though he might accept or repudiate, (which is the nature of every faculty,) yet

Vol. II.

* See The case alluded to, between the same parties, Fount. v. 2. p. 5. voce FACULTY?

No 20.

No back tack-duty or annualrent having been mentioned in a wadfet. In the particular circumfiances of the cafe, declarator of redemption allowed, without payment of annualrent.

No 21. A party, by a referved faculty in his contract of marriage, is allowed to provide to a fecond wife in liferent, and the children in fee, a certain fum. without mention of annualrent. Annualrent found due from the diffolution of the fecond marriage by the husband's death.