No 3.

due; yet it must, in the mean time, have very distressing consequences with refpect to the debtor. It commences a prescription of year and day, within which all his other creditors must carry on adjudications, whether their debts are due or If this was to be allowed, it would be impossible to carry on commerce in any fhape. Lord Stair, lib. 1. tit. 17. § 15. has laid down the rule of law very differently from what is contended for by the pursuer. His words are: 'Legal execution is not competent ordinarily till delay, because none should be purfued till he have failed; yet, in fome cases, the debtor may be pursued before the term, to pay at the term, as fi vergat ad inopiam.' Here the rule is laid down, and the exception. The purfuer's plea would convert the exception into the rule; and by that means would throw every debtor, who is ready to pay his debts punctually, as foon as they become due, into the same distress as if he had already failed in payment, and made execution against his effects necessary. diligence now infifted on is a stronger step than either the former arrestment or inhibition, which the Court dismissed as nimious; and is evidently emulous and vexatious, as the defender's credit is undoubted, he being worth feveral thousand pounds Sterling, and only engaged in the inland trade of manufactures, and not in any hazardous foreign trade. Neither are any of his creditors, or his other fifter, who has a much larger claim upon him than the purfuer, making any demand upon him; being perfectly fatisfied with his ability to pay. And although the defender, for peace fake, offered the pursuer security for his debt on reasonable terms, which he rejected; yet he is under no obligation, by law, to convey his lands for payment of a debt that is not due.

'THE LORDS adhered to the Lord Ordinary's interlocutor, as on p. 60.; and found expences due.' (See Inhibition.)

Act. And. Pringle. Alt. Ferguson.

Cockburn. Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 2. Fac. Col. No 173. p. 307.

1781. November 14.

Creditors of Sir Thomas Wallace-Dunlop, against Messirs Brown and Collinson, Bankers in London.

No 4.
Adjudication decreed, in fecurity of contingent claims.

SIR THOMAS WALLACE fold a part of his lands to Meffrs Brown and Collinson, at twenty-nine years purchase, according to a figned rental; which Sir Thomas became bound to warrant for twenty-seven years.

Upon this obligation of warrandice, Messis Brown and Collinson led an adjudication in security against Sir Thomas's other lands and estates; to which, in the ranking of Sir Thomas's creditors, it was

Objected by the creditors: No illiquid debt can be fecured by adjudication; Erskine, b. 2. tit. 12. § 9.; Stair, b. 3. tit. 2. § 15. An adjudication in fecurity is of that fort which has come in place of apprifings; with this difference only,

No 4.

that the legal never expires. It is, therefore, properly a fale under a perpetual power of redemption; but still it is a fale; and as such requires a liquid price. The adjudication in question, however, is founded on as a security, not only for the desiciencies alleged to have been already incurred, and which have not been liquidated by any decree, but also for desiciencies, which do not now, and may never exist.

Answered by the adjudgers: It is admitted, that an adjudication for payment cannot proceed, except upon a liquid debt. But this rule does not hold with respect to adjudications in security. And the reason of the distinction is obvious. By the old form of apprisings, as much of the debtor's heritage was given to the creditor as was reckoned equivalent to his debt; and unless the debt was liquid, the sheriff could not possibly determine what quantity of lands it was proper to make over. The same reason holds in special adjudications upon the first alternative of the act 1672: and, even in general adjudications for payment, it is necessary that the debt should be liquid, in order that the debtor may know the precise amount of the redemption-money.

But these reasons do not apply to adjudications in security: for though they are always general, and extend to the debtor's whole heritage; yet, as the legal never expires, the property can never be thereby transferred to the adjudger. Neither is it here necessary, that the debtor should know the precise amount of the debt; because he may at any time recover his lands, upon shewing that the oreditor has been fully satisfied.

Accordingly, this fort of adjudication has ever been confidered as a competent way of affecting the debtor's heritage, in security of such debts as can only be liquidated, de anno in annum, or of such as cannot properly be the soundation of an adjudication for payment. Thus, a widow may adjudge in security of her liferent; a cautioner in security of his relief; and a purchaser in security of his warrandice; Bankton, b. 3. tit. 2. § 78.; Hamilton against Chiefly, 24th February 1675; (See Adjudication in Implement) Bruce against Hepburn, 2d January 1684, observed by Fountainhall and Falconer, (No 1. b.t.) These several claims are not more liquid than the present. Like it they are contingent on suture events; but they are all equally capable of being secured by adjudication.

The Court had no difficulty upon the competency of the adjudication, as a fecurity for both the past and the future deficiencies; and therefore 'repelled the 'objection.'

Lord Reporter, Westhall.
Clerk, Ormer
Law.

For the Objectors, J. Swinton.

Alt. Robertson ..

Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 2. Fac. Col. No 1. p. 1.