

Cross-examined by Mr. WALKER,

The document in my hand, to which I referred to refresh my memory, during my examination in chief, was handed to me, this morning, by Mr. T. S. Brown, a witness who was examined yesterday. I do not know whether my brother, the Plaintiff, possessed any funds at the time of his arrest. The books of account were always regularly kept, and the debt to the defendants was entered therein.

Mr. LOUIS LALANNE. I am a merchant in Montreal, and know the Plaintiff. I knew him in December 1829, and January 1830. I saw him daily, and I was for a short time in his store. I deal in furs. My uncle, Louis Lalanne, the notary, who is since deceased, was then alive. Some two or three months before the arrest of the Plaintiff, I saw him and my uncle engaged together. I was told that they were engaged in making orders. I think I saw orders, amounting to £1000, or £1200. The Plaintiff applied to me for advice respecting Bills of Exchange, and the best mode of procuring them. I think Exchange might be procured on bills at six months. I believe that there was a good deal of Exchange in the market at the time to which this transaction refers. My opinion of the Plaintiff's character was always good; and I had a great respect for him, as an honest, industrious, and steady young man. There was a talk of the Plaintiff's going to the Indian country, in Upper Canada, on my account, to purchase furs for me. He did not make any attempts to conceal his sale to Bridge. I advised the sale to Bridge, when I was consulted on its propriety and advantages by Blanchard. Bridge's sign remained over the door of the shop for ten or twelve months, after he had quitted the place.

Cross-examined by Mr. WALKER,

I know that long notes have been exchanged, and I think that it often occurs. In the month of January 1829, there was a quantity of Government Exchange in the market. The rate of Exchange is determined by the amount of money in the market. The present rate of Exchange is from  $7\frac{1}{2}$  to 9 per cent. In 1829 Exchange was high. I was formerly examined in this cause. I have had conversations with the Plaintiff and his brother on these matters since the last trial. About the middle of January 1830, I had a conversation with the Plaintiff relative to his going to Upper Canada—this intention was prevented from being carried into effect by the arrest of the Plaintiff. I know that, had Plaintiff succeeded in obtaining Exchange, he intended to go to Upper Canada.

Mr. HENRY HERBERT. I know the parties in this cause, and I worked for the Plaintiff in 1829. I was foreman in the Plaintiff's manufacturing shop. He had a manufactory of hats, both in town and country. I was present when the Plaintiff bought the hats from the Defendants. I was in the Plaintiff's shop at the time Mr. Lindsay bargained for the sale of the hats, and also when the hats arrived. I recollect that the Plaintiff observed to Mr. Lindsay that the hats were high. The Plaintiff sold hats by wholesale, and witness assisted in making up the packages.

Cross-examined,

I speak of the Plaintiff's success in business from actual observation. I do not know the names of the country traders who had dealings with the Plaintiff, but he was in the habit of sending hats into the country every week. The Plaintiff once told me that he intended to sell out entirely, and to embark in another line of business.

Mr. EUSTACHE ST. DENIS. I know Daniel Bridge. He had transactions with Mr. Young, the auctioneer, and purchased from him on credit, for small amounts—this was in 1829. Bridge paid for them all, with the exception of one purchase, which remains still unpaid, and which was contracted two or three months before his failure. Bridge's credit was good at the time he contracted this last debt. Bridge's name was on the door of the shop which the Plaintiff had previously occupied. It sometimes occurs that, when a merchant sells out,