

K

A. They knew that. They knew it when Christie asked in the first place for the note that it was an accommodation. I inferred he knew it as far as I know from knowing what it was given as collateral to. I do not remember of any other reason. I do not remember ever having told him directly. I do not remember ever having heard the plaintiffs told that Mrs. Sparrow was an accommodation endorser on that note. I only know further from talk I had with Christie. The talk was this: Christie told me that the Bank of Montreal were bothering him about our note, Lafferty's and mine, and as a favor to him asked me to get an endorsement to secure the several notes he held. He showed me figures for the amount. I generally receive anything like a notice of protest addressed to Mrs. Sparrow but I have no distinct recollection of having received the notice of protest on the second note. I don't think it reached her. If it had she would have said something about it. I think there was a second renewal drawn up. I think this was endorsed by Mrs. Sparrow. I expect she endorsed it in the same way as the others because I asked her. I did not present it to him (Christie.) If it was presented to Christie it would be by T. B. Lafferty. I could not swear if it was presented or not. I was present with Lafferty when Christie asked me to get the first note endorsed. I am quite sure Mrs. Sparrow did not know for what purpose the note was to be used nor was there any conversation with her in connection with it at all. I don't remember if I was present at the time Lafferty left the first note at the bank. I do not remember if there was anything particular said when the second note was left with Scott. The second note was left at the bank as a renewal of the first. I mean the first note was given as collateral to the several notes mentioned. I think that makes up the amount.

Q. Was the second note left with the plaintiffs as collateral security to anything?

A. It was a renewal of the first note. He could not use the first note in the bank as it was overdue.

Q. Was the second note left with the plaintiffs as collateral security to anything?

A. That is all the answer I can give; it was left there as a renewal of the first one.

Q. Do you know for what purpose the plaintiffs were to hold the second note?

A. They were to hold it as a renewal of the first note.

Q. What did you understand by them holding it as a renewal of the first note?

30 A. I don't understand the question.

Q. What did you understand the plaintiffs were to do with the second note?

A. I gave them the renewal note and I did not understand what they were to do with it; there was nothing said as to what they were to do with it.

This closed the examination for the plaintiffs.

No questions by the defendants' advocate.