

* N. 1. Where the Heir of a Talcied Estate with his relatives and friends clauses do non abnegando & non
contrahendo debet in Robing contracted considerable personal debts and a gift of his single and twent
Ethical Robing been taken up great diligence used for payment. A Declaration of the Jurisdiction was raised,
wherein the purveyor inflicted to have the gift of Ethical dollars void, and the profits of the Estate
from the Incurring of the Jurisdiction, to belong to him as Heir. For that the' no adjudication was
had against the Talcied Estate till after the gift of Ethical, the personal debts anterior thereto was
a sufficient Jurisdiction, by which the contractor falling ipso facto from his Right, his Ethical
could not be gifted thereafter in the produce of the next Heir of Talcied. And therefore the same
Reason for making the actual contracting of debt an Jurisdiction ~~as well as~~ as where an adjudica-
tion is had: Because Law derutes the Right, when ~~is~~ void, and the Estate is not divided nor
the Heir injured more thereby, than by the contracting of debt. & of Granting that he bare contracting
of debt was no Jurisdiction, and that the Ethical Ethical was duly established, it could not be effec-
tual after the first adjudication was laid upon the Estate: For thereby the proprietor Robing full
from his Right ipso facto, the Ethical could last no longer than his tenants Right, which was extinguished
without any declaration; the' a declaration by instrument thereon be necessary to transfer and establish
the Right in the next Heir of Talcied and the purveyor suffers no prejudice thereby, because the
lands fall in Nonentity & he hath the Interests profits.

it was Answered, for the personal Prejudice 1°/ It is not the contracting of Debt that makes an
Infringement, but his allowing that Debt to become a Real Burden upon the property, ~~which~~
~~might become a Real Burden upon the property, whereby the same might be Reclaimed from the~~
holder of Tally as appears from the words of the Act of Parliament 1685. For if an Infringement
were incurred by the simple contracting of Debt, no man of Prudent could enjoy his Estate a week
without incurring an Infringement; he could have no commerce with mankind; he could make
no Bargain, nor Engage for necessaries; nor use his credit in any way, tho' ever so large
entailed Estates, & other Goods ten times more than the Dable. Nor are these inconveniences pallid
by allowing the Hearer to purge before Declaration. For this is not in His Law, and it is ridiculous to
suppose, that a Law unreasonable in itself to be made only to remise the Injuries of it, could be am-
mended by a soft Interpretation. Again, an Hear-off Tally, who talk an unentitled Estate more
than sufficient to pay him all his debt may perhaps be notable to clear it before Declaration or may
find it a great loss to oblige him to clear it. Besides the same may burden the Right of his own
estate with such conditions as he pleases; it were unreasonable to bind up another as to other
things than which concern the Estate. The Reason why a Tally'd Estate is not Elvited by an Adju-
dication therof against the contractor of the Tally is because his suffering it to be left vertakes his
Right of property, and therefore such an adjudication is ineffectual as being obtain'd contra non
Dominum. 2°/ It might may affect his own property with such clauses and conditions as pleases, which
will be effectual among his Heirs and Successors to the utmost Extent, and the Superior cannot refuse
to allow such frivolous and resolved clauses to be insert in the Instruments. But the basset cannot
thereby Impair his Bonds, & his Causalles belonging to the superior as such which are expressly
referred to him by the act 1685. And I consider 't is said the superiors Causalles are referred,
when he gets only the non Entry & plus, which the next Hear-off Tally's can at any time deprive
him of by entering basset, instead of the usual common course with the former lease life-
duration. The Estate once established is a species of superiority, where, though he may convey
and no ~~but~~ doth of the Rebek by voluntarily alienating his Lands or incurring an Infringement
can take away. For in this a Lien'd Estate differs from a common Assignment to thirdes & talls
which because it is no Real Right upon the Land but depends upon the cedants Right, confest howe from
his Interest comes to be extinguished.

The Lord's found that it is not the bare contracting of debt but the allowing it to be made real upon the Tenanted Land that makes an Insolvency; and that the Incurring an Irritancy of a Tenant takes not away his contraband Life rent Escheat already paid; and therefore just and the Liforant Escheat. 18 July 1722 ^{Hugh} Scot of Gala contra the personal creditors of the Deceased Sir James Scot of Gala.