letter F (after M.F.) stands. It is under this assessment that the respondent qualified.

The statute 3 Edw. VII. ch. 19 (O.), by sec. 76 enacts that no person shall be qualified to be elected a councillor of any local municipality unless he has, at the time of the election, as owner or tenant, a legal or equitable freehold or leasehold, or an estate partly freehold and partly leasehold, or partly legal and partly equitable, which is assessed in his own name on the last revised assessment roll, to at least the value following, over and above all charges, liens, and incumbrances affecting the same—in towns, freehold to $600, or leasehold to $1,200.

Before I consider these two points I may say that an objection was taken by Mr. Hodgins, acting for the respondent, that the relator had no status as such, having voted for the respondent at the election in question.

Evidence was given before me by three several witnesses that the relator had stated to them that he had so voted, and these statements were made both before and after these proceedings were begun.

To this Mr. Finlayson, for the relator, put in his cross-examination upon the affidavit he made to obtain the fiat for these proceedings, in which he says:—

"I did not vote for Chew (the respondent) this year, but I told Mr. Chew I did vote for him, as I did not want to create any hard feelings. It was after these proceedings were taken that I told Chew I had voted for him at the 1905 election. I did not mind telling a little falsehood, but I was not then under oath as I am now. I also told Mr. Craig that I voted for Mr. Chew. Didn't tell any one else that I can remember . . . if I told anybody immediately after the election that I voted for Chew it has escaped my recollection."

And Mr. Finlayson contends that this denial on oath by the relator that he voted for Chew outweighs his admissions to the contrary, not made on oath, and which should therefore be rejected.

It is, of course, well established that if the relator did actually vote for the respondent he has no status here. Some difficulty occurs to me here as to how it is ever brought out that a relator has voted for a respondent.

It is quite clear that under sec. 200 of the Act he could not "be required to state for whom he has voted," and it appears from the judgment of the late Chief Justice Moss in Re Lincoln Election, 4 A. R. 206, that evidence of statements voluntarily made by a voter as to how he voted cannot be