

BRAXFIELD. It is a rule of law, *quod fit lege prohibente nullum est*; and had that rule been introduced into the supply acts, we must have observed it; but there is no such thing said in these acts. The law *Barbarius Philippus* is much to the purpose, though not quoted at the bar; but there is little occasion to enter into that discussion, for any one may adjourn. Is it possible to suppose that the absence of the commissioners from the first meeting, whether that absence be accidental or intentional, can destroy the supply act for that year?

“The Lords repelled the objection to the division of the barony of Howstown, founded on want of powers in the commissioners.”

*Act. G. Ferguson. Alt. A. Wight, &c.*

---

1787. June 14. JAMES M'ADAM *against* ALEXANDER M'WILLIAM.

#### BILL OF EXCHANGE.

Regular negotiation not required of such Bills as are granted merely for the accommodation of the drawer.

Bills pass by indorsation as well after as before protest.

[*Fac. Coll. IX. 514; Dict. 1613.*]

BRAXFIELD. Bills have the privileges of bags of money for six months. It is natural and common to protest them. Why then should not indorsation be good even after protest? And why should bills lose their privileges by indorsation?

ESK GROVE. If, by neglect, a bill should not have been protested, according to the defender's argument, it would be *good*:—if duly protested, it would be *bad*.

On the 14th June 1787, “The Lords decerned against the defender, and found expenses due.”

*Act. Mat. Ross. Alt. — Maconochie.*

*Reporter, Stonefield.*

*N.B.* There were other questions here, but involved in facts.

---