on the back without any formal assignation, which shews the parties looked upon it as a bill. Replied, This note has neither the stile of a foreign nor inland bill, and could never have been protested and registered for not acceptance; and though it mentions the same being payable to the party or his order, and with exchange, yet many bonds run in that same mixed kind of stile. The Lords observed, That bills are exposed to much hazard of forgery, therefore their privileges were not to be extended, and found this was only a ticket, and could not claim the privileges, either as to the want of solemnities or summary execution, that bills have; only, it appearing to be all of one hand-writ and contexture, they ordained the parties to be heard if it was holograph, in which case it would be probative, though it wanted witnesses, if they offered to prove it was holograph.

Fountainhall, v. 2. p. 424.

1708. February 12.

Mr Robert Bundle, Merchant in London, against John Kennudy of Culzean.

No. 2.

John Kennedy of Culzean, having by his note promised to pay to David Crawford, or order, L. 35: 11s. Sterling, the 1st of September 1706, value received by him; and the said note being indersed to Mr Robert Bundie, who pursued Culzean for payment; the Lords found the said note was not a bill of exchange, and therefore the sum therein was compensable by the inderser's debt.

Fol. Die. v. 2. p. 211. Forbes, p. 239.

** See what Lord Fountainhall says of this case, in the case which follows.

1711. December 6.

WILLIAM KING, Merchant in Glasgow, against Robert Esdale, Merchant in Dumfries.

No 3.

best Esdale, for payment of L. 25 Sterling, and interest thereof, which Robert Esdale, by his note, 2d December 1709, promised to pay upon the first of May then next, to William King, or order for value received; the Loads found, That the English statute of 3. and 4. A. c. 9. giving the like remedy upon promissory notes, as is now used upon bills of exchange, for the space of three years, though made perpetual by the 7. A. c. 25. an act of the British Parhament since the Union, doth not extend to promissory notes in Scotland; because the British statute doth only make the former, which before was a temporary law of England, to be a perpetual law thereof; and the British statute