North Marysburgh, the defendant has not sufficient property qualification. But it is urged on behalf of the defendant that as he had in fact such qualification, except for what is claimed to be an error in the entry in the roll in not having his name bracketed with that of his father, that error should be rectified, and the roll thus amended.

In making the assessment, the assessor carried with him a blank assessment book, in which he made the entries in pencil. This book contains columns, with headings and numbers, similar to those in the revised roll. It was referred to as the "blotter." It was not before the Court of Revision and contains no certificate as to correctness. In this blotter the entries regarding the defendant and his father and their lands are the same substantially as those in the revised roll. But the names are bracketed and the amounts assessed against them are carried out in a total opposite the name of Frederick Rose, of $3,050. The defendants afterward received a notice of assessment in accordance with this. The assessor was not able to explain how the variation between the form of assessment in the blotter and that in the revised roll occurred. He suggested that as his wife read to him from the blotter while he transcribed into the revised roll the variation may have thus happened.

Assessment notices were produced for the years 1893 and 1894 in which the form of assessment was similar to that in this "blotter." But in the roll of 1891, prepared by the defendant himself, when he was assessor, the form of assessment was the same as that in the present roll; the names not bracketed.

In support of the defendant's contention that I should now amend the present roll, or consider the defendant's qualification sufficient, notwithstanding any errors in the entries, the following among other cases are cited: *Reg. ex rel. Lachford* v. *Frizell*, 6 P.R. 12; *Reg. ex rel. McGregor* v. *Ker*, 7 U.C.L.J. 67; *The Stormont Case; Hodgins' Election Cases*, 21; *In re Johnson and the Corporation of Lambton*, 40 U.C.R. 297. I have failed to find in these cases authority for the defendant's contention.

In *Lachford* v. *Frizell*, the error or defect in the form of assessment dealt with was simply that the name of the defendant (Frizell) instead of being written under that of the tenant (Bowen) and bracketed with it, followed it on he same line, and was also on the same line with the property assessed. Mr. Dalton, Master in Chambers, correctly deals with the matter when he says (at p. 13, 6 P.R.): "The defendant's name, however, is written in a column embraced by the general heading 'names of taxable parties,' and that it was so written for the purpose of assessing him, is known from the other facts."

Re Johnson and the Corporation of Lambton deals with a somewhat similar defect, and certainly furnishes the defendant in this case with no further assistance.

In the *Stormont* case it was held that a voter being duly qualified in other respects, and having his name on the roll and list, but by mistake entered as tenant instead of owner, or occupant, or vice versa, was not thereby disfranchised. An apparently good reason for this would be found in the fact that under the statute a tenant has just the same right to a vote as a freeholder, and it could, of course, make no difference as to which character he should vote in, so long as he was properly qualified in either.