ARRESTMENT.

Another point having fallen to be determined, viz. Whether Munzie was factor for the Colonel only, or both for him and the officers? As to this, it was excepted for the defender, That he opponed his factory, in the terms whereof he is only liable, which is only from the Colonel, and to whom alone he is declared accountable; and, by the forefaid inftructions by King William, the factor is only to iffue out the money conform to his Majefty's directions; fo that where no fuch directions were, it behoved to be by the Colonel, who had the only power to receive, and was accountable to his Majefty for the money of his regiment. And, though other officers alfo contributed for the agent's pay, yet fuch an office was abfolutely neceffary for management of the regiment's affairs.

Replied for the purfuer, That Munzie's difcharge from the Lieutenant-Colonel was opponed, which bears in terminis, that he hath made full and complete payment of what arrears he had in his hands, notwithftanding of arreftments laid in his hands by the purfuers. 2do, Though, out of refpect to Colonels, they have the nomination of the factor, yet ftill, by the nature of the truft, he was factor alfo for the regiment, and liable to count to every officer for his pay, as well as to the Colonel for his. 3tio, The defender owned this by clearing with the feveral officers, without noticing the Colonel, or receiving his warrant to pay any of them. 4to, There is a decifion of the cafe in terminis, 20th February 1712,* James Napier contra George Grant, paymafter of Grant's regiment; where the whole above defences were proponed and repelled.

THE LORDS found. That the defender was factor for the behoof of the officers the time of the arreftment, and therefore that their money was then arreftable in his hands.

> Act. Boswell. Alt. Se. Clerk, Mackenzie. Bruce, Nos 44. 45. p. 57.

1729. December. JAMESON against LECKIE.

MATHEW STEWART having fome bills payable to himfelf, figned blank indorfations, and gave them to Leckie of Arnmore, to be delivered to fome of his creditors; before delivery arreftment was ufed in Leckie's hands, and a forthcoming infifted in.—The Lords found, That exhibition, not arreftment, was the habile diligence to affect bills thus deposited, and therefore that Leckie had warrantably given up the bills according to his commiffion, notwithftanding the arreftment.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 56.

1736. February 12. HALE, Minister of Linton, against HIS CREDITORS.

OF this date, I find it marked in the diary, That, on report of Lord Coupar, the LORDS found a minister's flipend arreftable.

* Examine General Lift of Names.

C. Home, No 12. p. 33.

No 46. Bills deposit. ed, blank indorfed, cannot be arrefted in the hands of the depofitary.

No 47.

Minister's ftr.

pend arreft-

No 45.

711