

having in his Contract of Marriage bound himself to invest his Lady's
 Liferent to be held of his Heirs Male and of Tailzie, and obliged the
 to warrant the Liferent and also to pay certain Provisions to Heir Female
 and entertain them till the Age of 21, a Tailzie was sufficiently established
 thereby; it being inconsistent that any should warrant a Right upon a
 Tailzie except the Proprietor, or that an Heir Female provided to a Tailzie
 out of it should also have the Estate itself. The Lord however did not do
 this Point; being shy to sustain a Tailzie, which is the Alienation of
 whole Estate, tending to debar his own Children from the Succession
 of the Estate, and leave judges an arbitrary Power in so great a Matter. But
 a Fideicommissa in the wife's Land could have been made even by Warrant
 -cilly importing them: So Tailzies are sometimes tacitly inferred from the
 Proprietor's presumed Will, or from Consequences, &c. If a Man having
 taken a Wadset to himself and certain Heirs of Tailzie both hereafter and
 the Reversion to himself and his Heirs in general; this Reversion would be
 just Interpretation, descend to the Heirs of Tailzie: Because it is not sup-
 -posable, that a wife's Man would give the Wadset to one Heir, and the Reversion
 to another. *M'Kenzie Treatise of Tailzies* A Father who had
 three Sons, whereof the eldest was dumb, having made a Disposition of his
 Estate to his second Son, which failing to return to himself and his Heirs
 declaring that, because his eldest Son was not able to manage his Estate
 he disposed it to the second whom he intended to alim out the eldest; and after
 the second's Death, the eldest having as Heir to his Father, claimed the Estate
 the Estate was found to descend to his third Brother, the eldest being past his
 elogio as unfit to manage, and allowed only an Alimment which is inconsistent
 with a Right of Property. *Hay of Douglas contra Hay*. The Sir James
 Stewart (Answers to *Douglas* *Tit. Heirs Male*) thinks that the eldest Son
 might have been ^{excluded by his Father} in the (case of ~~tailzie~~ provided, and yet restored
 by Law in the Event happening.

Albeit no Obligation that dispenses not with Delivery is valid, till it be
 delivered, yet Tailzies require no Delivery: Because the Maker retaining
 still such an Interest therein, as intitles him sufficiently to be Keeper thereof,
 Law doth not presume that he designed to keep the Tailzie from being oblig-
 -tory by his not Delivery. *M'Kenzie* *Tit.*

The inherent Right in every Man to dispose of what is his own, brought for the
 Tailzies, but in Process of Time the Daughter destroyed the Mother and the
 -died became a great Restraint upon the Freedom of Disposal. The great In-
 -conveniences ^{thereof} prompted those bound up by them to seek their Invention
 for Methods to render them ineffectual. In Order to clear how much the
 Maker and Member of a Tailzie are tied thereby; I shall consider their
 -ferent Strength and Effects of a Tailzie, according to the several ordinary
 -ferent

Tenors thereof.
 Where the Maker of a formal Tailzie, doth only substitute the persons
 who are to succeed to him or after another, as in this simple Tailzie: And
 the Destination may be made either by him, or by any of the succeeding
 Members, even the Inhibitor were so: So long as any one of
 them still remains in interit the Fee and he is not bound by an
 Inhibition; without an Obligation not to alter the Tailzie. *Lab 3. L. 2. c.*
9. 15. Treatise of Tailzies A Yobleson having provided a Tailzie
 to his eldest Son and the Heirs Male of his Body, which failing to return
 to himself, and after his own Decease reverting to the Heirs Male of his Body
 of his eldest Grandson, and the Heirs Male of his Body, which failing to
 return to himself, and after his own Decease reverting to the Heirs Male of his Body
 of his other Grandsons, which failing to return to himself, and after his own Decease
 reverting to the Heirs Male of his own Body without Disposition. The eldest Son
 executed a Deed, whereby calling Heirs Male of his own Body, he obli-
 -gated himself to provide the Estate in Favour of his eldest Daughter and the
 Heir Male of her Body; which failing to his other Daughters, in their Or-
 -der. After the Decease of the Heir Male of the Maker of this last In-
 -tail's Body without Issue, there arose a Competition for the Estate, be-
 -twixt the only Son of his eldest Daughter, and the Heir Male of the second
 Grandson of the Maker of the first Intail. It was pleaded for the latter,
 that the Maker of the original Intail having conveyed his Estate to
 Heirs Male, with a Clause of Return to himself failing them, that impor-
 -ted a prohibition to alter the Conveyance and Course of Succession
 established for the Preservation of his Name and Family: So that his
 great Grandson had no Power by a gratuitous Deed to settle the Estate
 upon his own Daughter and her Heirs. For when the Maker of an
 Intail invests himself of the Fee and substitutes himself to his own
 Donees; that Substitution being purchased at no less Value than the
 whole Subject, is in the strictest Sense onerous, and consequently in-
 -terable by any of the intermediate Substitutes in Prejudice of the Ma-
 -ker of the Tailzie. To which it was answered so Where an Estate is gi-
 -ven away to a Stranger or one not a *liquis successuris*, with a Limitation
 to particular Heirs, and a Provision of Return to the Grantor; this induces
 hath the Force of a Paction between the grantor and Stranger Receiver
 of the Estate, that failing the Heirs in the Limitations the Estate should
 return to the Grantor: Because he is not settling his Succession, but gives
 away his Estate from his Successors for a particular Use, which implies
 this reasonable Condition that *causa cessante* when such Use is at an End,
cessante effectus, he himself or his righteous Heir shall recover the Estate.
 As in a late Case betwixt the Duke of Douglas and Lockhart of Lee
 where