

1744. *December 7.* WALKER *against* WALKER.

No. 5.

SUBSTITUTION of the legatar's children was thought implied ;—and therefore Robert Walker having disponded his effects to William Walker, and in case of his death without children, ordered him to pay certain sums to different persons, and *inter alios* to Mary and Janet Walker, without adding their heirs or assignees ; these died before William, but left issue : The Lords found a substitution to their children implied.

See Wallace *against* Dickie, 8th February 1734, *voce* PRESUMPTION.

See NOTES.