

corroborative in the active part of the clause, it must be in its nature such as would be adequate to establish the commission of the offence, independent altogether of the evidence of which it is corroborative.

Mr. GAMERON (North Victoria). I do not agree with the observations of my hon. friend from West Durham as to the effect of my amendment; but if it were correct that the adoption of the amendment would require the essential part of the offence to be proved by evidence other than that of the principal female witness, I think it would be an amendment that ought to be adopted by the House. I think it is not desirable that we should put the principal person accused at the mercy of any woman, herself as guilty as he is in an essential part of the offence, and have her evidence alone sufficient to convict him. The words of the Bill are simply that the evidence of the woman should be corroborated by other material evidence. Now, I say that that is altogether too vague. Any Judge would be bound to rule, that any corroboration upon any point, however insignificant it might be, but which was yet material to the entire charge, was sufficient to satisfy the words of the Statute. For instance, the parties were seen together, on a particular occasion on which the woman alleged the offence to have been committed, in the neighborhood in which she said it occurred—that would be corroborative evidence of a material circumstance, but it would not be evidence that, in my opinion, ought to be sufficient to corroborate the testimony of the woman so as to secure a conviction upon it. I think the Bill, without the safeguard of the words which I have moved to add, would be open to most dangerous abuse. I think that probably it is a Bill that, if it becomes law, will be abused in any case; but certainly without that safeguard it would be likely to be far more seriously abused than it would be with these words added. I must press the amendment I have moved.

Mr. CAMERON (West Huron). I think, with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that the language made use of by the hon. member for North Norfolk in his Bill, with respect to corroborative evidence, is too vague; but then the hon. gentleman's proposition is a little too strong. Now, to establish a case under the provision of the Bill, two elements must clearly appear for the prosecution—it must be shown that there is a promise to marry, and it must be shown that there was a seduction following the promise to marry. Now, according to the proposition of the hon. member, the woman's evidence, as pointed out by the hon. member for West Durham, goes for nothing, and the case must be proved as if the woman had not gone into the witness box at all. Now, if that is so, it is absurd to call it corroborative evidence; it is new evidence altogether, a new case altogether, depending on evidence entirely distinct from that of the female. If the hon. member had put this proposition to the House, that upon the two material elements of the prosecution there should be corroborative evidence, I would support it. I would support a clause that would read thus:

"In every case arising under Sections 1, 2 and 3 of this Act the testimony of the female respecting whom the offence is alleged to have been committed shall not be deemed sufficient to sustain a conviction, unless the same is corroborated by other material evidence with respect to the said promise of marriage and the seduction aforesaid."

Now, I think that covers the whole case—covers the points of my hon. friend, at all events, as I understood them from his observation—and it will not leave the prosecution entirely dependent upon testimony outside that of the woman. There is no reason in the world why the woman's testimony should not go for something; the defendant is allowed to give evidence, and certainly the evidence of the female in the case ought to be taken as well as his. I will support the proposition if it goes back to the Committee of the Whole, that the evidence of the woman must be cor-

roborated with respect to the material points necessary to make out the successful prosecution; but I shall oppose the proposition to practically eject altogether the evidence of the female.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron, Victoria) agreed to on the following division:—

## YEA'S:

## Messieurs

Amyot,	Dodd,	McDonald (Cape Breton)
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dugas,	Macmaster,
Beaty,	Dupont.	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Benoit,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McGreevy,
Benson,	Fortin,	McLelan,
Bergeron,	Gagné,	McNeill,
Billy,	Gigault,	Méthot,
Blondeau,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier)	Mitchell,
Brecken,	Girouard (Kent),	Moffat,
Cameron (Inverness),	Gordon,	Montplaisir,
Cameron (Victoria),	Grandbois,	Orton,
Campbell (Victoria),	Guilbault,	Quimet,
Carling,	Guillet,	Reid,
Caron,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cimon,	Haggart,	Rykert,
Costigan,	Hall,	Scott,
Coughlin,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Curran,	Homer,	Small,
Daly,	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	Kinney,	Valin,
Dawson,	Kranz,	Vanasse,
De Beaujeu,	Labrosse,	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell), and
Desjardins,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Williams.—73.
Dickinson,		

## NAYS:

## Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Paint,
Auger,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain,	Harley,	Paterson (Essex),
Bernier,	Hay,	Pickard,
Blake,	Hilliard,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Innis,	Ray,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Richey,
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Ross (Middlesex),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jamieson,	Scrivner,
Casey,	Keefer,	Somerville (Brant),
Casgrain,	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Catudal,	Kirk,	Springer,
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Laurier,	Trow,
Cockburn,	McMillan (Huron),	Vail,
Colby,	McCraney,	Watson,
Cook,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
Fisher,	McIsaac,	Wheler,
Fleming,	Mulock,	Wilson, and
Forbes,	O'Brien,	Wood (Brockville).—61.
Foster,		

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

## After Recess.

## CRÉDIT FONCIER FRANCO-CANADIEN.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved the third reading of Bill (No. 22) respecting the Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien.

Mr. AUGER. I have the honor to move that this Bill be read the third time this day six months. Mr. Speaker, while discussing this Bill the other evening, the hon. member for Bellechasse asked whether we opposed this Bill because it concerned a French company and lent French money. This is not the case; and I do not desire in the least degree to act unfair towards this company. If it merely desired to be placed on the same footing with other organizations of the same character, we would not have objected, or now object, to this measure. This company came to this country in 1880, and applied for an Act of incorporation to the Quebec Legislature, and obtained all they requested. They represented that they could lend money at 6 per cent. on certain conditions, and were incorporated. Later, they secured an Act of incorporation from this House, and extended their privileges over the