form of a bill; in respect it was answered, That if the bill was the result of a count and reckoning, there could be no harm in expressing the cause of granting; and, once fixing this point, the very retiring of the bill is a general discharge of course. The rule is that it cannot vitiate a bill, to stipulate what would equally follow, though it were not expressed. See General Discharges, &c.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 95:

Act. H. Murray-Kynnynmound.

Alt. H. Home.

1724. January 31. Hugh Hamilton, Merchant in Edinburgh, against Captain James Dalrymple.

CAPTAIN DALRYMPLE granted an obligation to deliver to Walter Riddel, a fish-debenture, in payment of a certain quantity of falt, as valued by Charles Sheriff in Prestonpans: This obligation was indorsed by Riddel to Mr Hamilton, and by him to William Dundas, his correspondent at Rotterdam; who again indorsed it to Van Vred at Amsterdam. The Gaptain having refused payment, the obligation was returned to Mr Hamilton, and the two last indorsations were deleted.

Mr Hamilton pursued the Captain for delivery of the fish-debenture, or payment of the value of the salt, in terms of the obligation. Among other desences for the Captain, it was pleaded, 1mo, That this obligation was not indorsable, as being rather a contract of sale of salt than a bill. 2do, That it had been twice indorsed after it came into Mr. Hamilton's hands, and these indorsations deleted; which, as it was unwarrantable, so it could never make the right return to the pursuer; but he ought to have taken a re-indorsation from the person to whom it was last indorsed.

It was answered for the pursuer; rmo, That the obligation being betwixt merchants; and in remercatoria, it was very properly conveyed by indorsation; and this was agreeable to their constant practice. 2do, The practice of scoring indorsations was never before quarrelled among merchants; and, if it were found unwarrantable, it must destroy all commerce; for merchants cannot recover payment from their debtors abroad, without indorsing their bills to some trustee; and it would be hard to oblige the indorse, in case of not recovering payment, to re-indorse the same, for thereby he would become liable for the drawer.

THE LORDS repelled the defences, in respect of the answers. See SECT. I.

Act. Jo. Stewart. Alt. H. Dalrymple, sen. Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 74. Edgar, p. 18.

\*\* The same was found, 25th July 1744, Hope against Nellson; and the indersee to a blank indersation of a debenture was preferred to a creditor of the inderser, who, posterior to the indersation, had arrested in the hands of the Commissioners of the Customs.

Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 74. from MS.

No 7.

No 8. An obligation to deliver a fifth debenture, in payment of a quantity of falt, found indorfable as a bill.