

Distribution of minors - Marriage Settlements

provision for the Debt of either, is valid and secure from reduction, unless the Minor's Lefion be very plain and enormous, and he have no Expectation of Relief or Indemnity from his Factors or Curators. *Vestib. N. 17.*

2^o Restitution is allowed to Minors against extravagant and unnecessary Gifts tit. C. si advers. donat. whether simple or remuneratory. *Odib. de restit. qn. 50. Art. 4.* Under remuneratory Donations of comprehend Focher and Gifts propter Nuptias. For tho a Woman is by no Law discharged to give all her Goods in Focher. *C. de pone dnt.* it is not always expedient to do so.

By the Dutch Law, as Roman's whole Estate fit date by virtue of the legal Communion of Goods between married Persons, unless it be otherwise provided by Contract. Therefore a Woman cannot be restored there upon Minority and Lefion, against a Disposition of all she has to her Husband & sustentia Opera Matrimonij. Nor is a Man restored contra immundam Coagulation Spousalitiam, or against an excessive jointure given to his Wife: because the Woman perhaps would not have consented to marry, had she not been invitata auro veluti imbre by Receipt of large Gifts or a great Dowry, of which she ought not to be defrauded after her Marriage. *Vestib. Comm. ad tit. ff. de minor. N. 18. & 19.*

By the Civil Law, a Female Minor may be restored if found lewd by giving an immoderate Focher. *C. si advers. dnt. vizi.* such as the Husband's Quality, or the jointure he gave her did not deserve. And a Husband who is Minor may be restored against excessive gifts propter Nuptias. *Arg. C. si advers. donat.* or an extravagant jointure to his Wife.

By our Law, a Female Minor having disposed to her Husband and the Heirs of the Marriage, and these failing to his Heirs, above 3000 pounds of Money and 1100 pounds of Land, rent in Edinburgh, for a simple life-rent to herself of her own Land, and of 8 or 10 Chaldors of Virtual out of her Husband's Estate: the Contract was reduced in order to give the Wife a more suitable jointure by a Lefion of all that belonged to herself, besides the provision out of her Husband's Fortune; but sustained as to the Fee in Favour of him and the Heirs of the Marriage and his own substituted Heirs. *22 November 1664. McGill contra Ruthven of Gordon*
 A Contract of Marriage was reduced at the instance of the Wife upon this ground that she had in the 17 years of her age disposed the property of her first marriage to the Husband who at the time was obnoxious and not in a condition to secure any suitable provision to her effectually. *27 July 1708. Byers contra Reid. An Heiree who was Minor, having not only quitted the Fee of her first marriage, but also excluded herself*

from

Resolution of minors - Act. Transactions of dutifp.
claim by their friends & agents
in bonds, &c.

134

from a Lefion thereof in the case of Children of the Marriage who happened to exist, for a provision secured to her by her Husband's personal Obligation, which came to nothing by his dying Bankrupt: she was found to have interest to reduce the Contract upon Minority & Lefion, in so far as it cut her off from the Lefion of her own Property. Allbeit she was by the Contract to Lefion her own and her Husband's Mans, and to have some power of Disposal failing Children of the Marriage. *25 July 1710 Chalmers contra Creditors of Lyon. A Minor's Obligation in his Contract of Marriage to infest the Heir of that Marriage in the Fee of his whole Estate that was considerable, was reduced at his instance with the Concurrence of his Creditors 7 March 1623 L. Bargany contra his Son. But another Minor who for 1000. Marks of Focher oblige himself to ~~infest~~ his Wife in a Lefion of all his Estate and the Conquest during the Marriage, and failing Children of the Marriage to pay 5000 Marks and some other things to her Father, was allowed to reduce the Provision to his Father in Law, but not his Wife's Lefion, no Creditor concurring in the Reduction albeit it was alledged, that if the Wife was the longest Liver, their Children would be destitute of all mean of Subsistence. *4 July 1632 Davison contra Hamilton.* For tho the Roman Law required an equal proportion inter Doleme & Donationem propter nuptias, our Law doth not stint Husband's in the granting Lefion provisions to their Wives, where there is no complaint of Creditors wronged. The Fear about the Children's Maintenance, in case of their Mother's Survival was not regarded: since that was an Uncertainty and she might happen to die before the Father, or they might die before she came to have the Use of her Lefion; and if she and they both should outlive the Father, Law would oblige her to allement them.*

3^o Allo hoc ipso quod a lice discedit, videtur sufficiens transactionis causa esse. *C. 65. g. i. ff. de cond. indeb.* yet if after Transaction with a Minor it appear that he statim lubricitate passed from a clear Right, which any person major siens & prudens would not have done, nothing hinders him to be relieved and the other party to be retroselyed in *Statu quo prius* *C. i. d. 2. C. si advers.* transact. But the Curators of a Minor having bona fide bought a Lefion affecting his Estate; the Minor was found to stand to the bargain notwithstanding of eventual Lefion by the Lefioner's dying shortly ~~after~~ ^{before} a Cancer she had then in her Breast: in respect the Curators knew not of it, and acted prudently in all Appearance. *January 1691 Fletcher of Abercady contra Murray of Blackbarony and others.* The Faculties of Law in the Dutch Universities being thereafter consulted upon this Case, gave a contrary opinion to the following Purpose. That tho a Just or might transact an uncertain Plea for avoiding Expenses and the Hazard of losing the whole by a Sentence yet where nothing in the Minor's Right is controverted, but the Continuance

+ In us to this case *Forster v. L. & T. 625.* of