

No 15.

against forgeries, which they would be greatly subject to, were they allowed to be proper vehicles, for conveying gratuities *inter vivos* or *mortis causa*. The pursuers acknowledgment, that a bill cannot be in the form or style of a *mortis causa* donation, is an unwary giving up of the cause. Can a tolerable reason be assigned, if a bill may relate to a *mortis causa* donation, that this relation must not be expressed in the bill? The defender takes it for a general rule, without exception, whatever is the true and lawful *cause* of granting a writ, may truly and lawfully be expressed in the writ; and she submits it, if their acknowledgment does not turn strongly against the pursuers, That since a *mortis causa donatio* cannot be expressed in a bill, a *mortis causa donatio* cannot be the *cause* of a bill; and that a bill is not the proper vehicle for such conveyances.

‘THE LORDS found, That a legacy, or *donatio mortis causa*, cannot be habily and effectually constituted by a bill.’ See LEGACY.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 95. Rem. Dec. v. 1. No 35. p. 72.

1724. February 13.

KATHARINE, ANNA, and CHRISTIAN HUTTONS, against DAVID HUTTON.

No 16.

Found, that a bill granted on death-bed, was not a legal method of constituting a debt or legacy, even to the effect of affecting moveables, in so far as the bill was gratuitous.

THESE pursuers insisted in a reduction of a bill for L. 350 Scots, granted by their father, when on death-bed, to his brother the defender: They alleged several circumstances to infer that it had been unduly elicited; but principally insisted on this reason in law for avoiding of it, *viz.* That it was granted on death-bed, and that it appeared, from the defender’s acknowledgment, to be gratuitous, at least as to L. 300, and therefore was of the nature of a legacy, which could not be legally constituted by a bill; for a legacy ought to be contained in some formal and probative writ, such as a testament duly executed: And though bills were probative in matters of commerce, yet in cases so very foreign to that business, as the granting of legacies, their privileges could not take place. Thus in the case of Sir Robert Myrton against George Livingston *, where Sir Andrew Myrton had accepted a bill, as an additional portion to his daughter, payable after his decease, the Lords found the bill null, as not being in *re mercatoria*; and 9th November 1722, Fulton *contra* Blair, No 15. p. 1411. it was found that a legacy, or *donatio mortis causa*, could not be habily constituted by a bill. And if such bills were allowed to be granted by one on death-bed, it would make way for many impositions upon weak dying persons.

It was *answered* for the defender: That the law required no other solemnities to deeds upon death-bed, than such as were necessary in other writs; and, therefore, as bills were probative of a gift, and were good when granted even without an onerous cause, by one person in health to another, there was no law incapacitating a dying person, when in sound judgment, to give a donative to his friend in the same way. And the argument, from possible impositions, might be good

* See PROVISIONS to HEIRS and CHILDREN.

for making a new law; but, as the law stood at present, the bill was good and probative.

No 16.

THE LORDS found, That a bill granted on death-bed, was not a legal method of constituting a debt or legacy, even to affect moveables, in so far as the bill was gratuitous.

Reporter, Lord Cullen.

A&T. Jo. Forbes.

A&T. Pat. Grant.

Clerk, Mackenzie.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 95. Edgar, p. 31.

1736. November 26. and January 7. 1737.

WEIR against PARKHILL.

MARY WEIR, relict of Malcolm M'Gibbon musician in Edinburgh, accepted a bill for L. 7000 Scots, payable to John Weir of Kerse her brother, of a date prior to her second marriage with John Parkhill, of the following tenor: 'Dear Sifter, Pay to me, John Weir of Kerse, or my order, at my dwelling-house in Edinburgh, eighteen months after date, the sum of L. 7000, Scots money, value due by you to me, as your deceased husband ordered you; make thankful payment, and oblige,' &c.

No 17.
Found in general that a donation cannot be constituted by a writing in the form of a bill.

In a process at Weir's instance against Parkhill, the second husband of the said Mary Weir, for payment of this bill, the LORDS, by their interlocutor of the 26th November 1736, Found, 'that a donation cannot be constituted by a writing in the form of a bill, and found it proved by the tenor of the writing in question, that the same is gratuitous, and therefore sustained the defence and assolzied.' And, on advising petition and answers, by their interlocutor 7th January 1737, Found 'that a donation cannot be constituted by a writing in the form of a bill; and found it proved by the tenor of the writing in question, joined with the pursuer's admission in the course of the process, that there was no testament executed by the deceased Malcolm M'Gibbon, Mary Weir's first husband, ordering the payment of the sum in debate, and therefore found that the said writing is gratuitous,' and with that addition, 'adhered to their former interlocutor.'

Neither of the statutes 1681 nor 1696 have said any thing to determine what is a proper bill, what not. They have given force to no writing as a bill, which such writing would not have had before. All they do is, to give the further privileges of annualrent, and diligence, to writings, supposed to be probative as bills; so that what writing constitutes a bill, is left to be gathered from the practice, and law of nations; and as, by the practice of nations, bills were devised as a vehicle for transporting money, for the utility of commerce; it was said, that the very first notion of a bill was, that it be for value, either with respect to the drawer or acceptor; and where no value is, the very reason ceases for which bills were, by the practice of nations, introduced.