1580

and the set

WILLIAM YOUNG against GEORGE FORBES. 1749. June 29.

COLIN CAMPBELL being employed by the Society at London for Propagating the Gofpel in foreign parts, as a preacher in Philadelphia, drew a bill upon their treasurer, 26th June 1747, for L. 30 Sterling, payable thirty days after date, to Alexander Forbes merchant in Philadelphia, who indorfed and fent it to William Young, merchant in Aberdeen; and he, 17th August, indorfed it to George Forbes, merchant there, taking his bill for the value.

George Forbes fent the bill to London, where it was diffeonoured; but took no proteft, nor informed the indorfer before the 4th of October.

William Young charged George Forbes on the bill granted by him, who fufpended upon the recourse competent to him on the diffeonoured bill; which he was not bound to proteft, being indorfed long after it fell due.

THE LORD ORDINARY, 8th November 1748, ' found, That the bill indorfed by the fufpender to the charger, as value of the bill charged on, was not duly negotiated; and therefore that there lay no recourse thereon.'

On a bill and anfwers, the LORDS remitted to merchants to report their opinions, which were, that no proteft was neceffary. But authorities were cited from Japhrae's Treatife of Monies and Exchange; Molloy, b. 2. c. 10. § 27.; and Hay's Negotiator's Magazine, \S 33. that when bills do not arrive before the time they fall due, payment ought to be made immediately, and a proteft taken, if it is not made; to which it was faid, that by these authorities the duty of protesting lay on the indorfer, to whose hands, as he alleged, the bill came after it fell due, not on the indorfee who purchafed after that time.

' THE LORDS, 16th June, found that recourse was competent; and refufed a bill and adhered.'

> Clerk, Gibson. Act. Lockbart. Alt. Burnet. Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 84. D. Falconer, v. 2. No 76. p. 81.

No 148. A bill was not prefented for acceptance, till after the expiry of the days of grace. Although the drawee had no funds belonging to the drawer, recourse was denied.

June 28. 1755.

JOHN HART, Merchant in Warrington, against JAMES GLASSFORD, Merchant in Glafgow.

WARNOCK, merchant in Glafgow, drew a bill upon Smith, merchant in London, bearing value in his hands, and payable forty days after date, to Glassford. or order.

Glafsford indorfed this bill to Hart for value : Before the bill became due Warnock died, being at that time, as was contended, infolvent. The bill, after various indorfations, was, on the third day after the day of payment, indorfed

No 147. A bill did not arrive till after the term of payment had elapfed. No proteft was taken for dishonour, nor intimation given for many months. Yet recourfe was found ftill competent.