

have been jointly and severally made by them, dated 19th January, 1903, for \$1,000, payable, with interest at 5 per cent., 6 months after date to the order of plaintiff.

The Lockeridges made no defence. Mary J. Campbell said that her name upon the note was not placed there by her or by her authority.

A. B. Macdonald, Brussels, for plaintiff.

R. Vanstone, Wingham, for defendant.

BRITTON, J.—Plaintiff is a labourer, an illiterate man, and somewhat peculiar as to his money matters. He had confidence in defendant Mary J. Campbell, and so on or about 14th May, 1900, he placed in her hands for safe-keeping a sum exceeding \$1,600, and defendant deposited this in her own name in the Bank of Hamilton at Wingham.

The other defendants lived at Brussels, and had a woollen mill there. Their business in December, 1902, had begun to decline, although the firm did not actually fail, so William says, until after the note sued upon fell due. William was, however, on the lookout for money. He knew that plaintiff had money in the hands of defendant, and apparently he at that time had the confidence of both plaintiff and defendant.

The evidence of William Lockeridge is quite clear, and it is that he and plaintiff made two visits to defendant Campbell, and on the first occasion he asked her if she would indorse for him, and she said she would. At that time the money was at Wingham, and she said she would bring it to Brussels. . . . He says the second visit was on 19th January, 1903, the day the note bears date.

Defendant Campbell says she did not sign this note. . . . The evidence is in direct conflict, and I must endeavour to arrive at the truth by a consideration of collateral facts. . . .

It is, in view of the evidence, a thing of great importance that defendant Campbell's name is apparently written with entirely different ink from the other signatures. The note was drawn up by Mr. Blair, solicitor for William Lockeridge. William says the names were all signed at defendant Campbell's house, with one pen and with ink from one bottle. . . . That, in my opinion, cannot be correct. Plaintiff is seeking to establish this claim against defendant Campbell mainly by the evidence of William Lockeridge, the man who obtained the money. The claim is met by the strong denial of defendant Campbell and by the circumstances. . . . Defendant Campbell seems trustworthy; of course she is interested in the result to the extent of what is a large amount for either plaintiff or defendant to lose; but she is not more interested