

had enough of it in other forms, and this honest attempt of my hon. friend to correct abuses of that kind is one that should receive the support of every hon. member of this House. I am afraid the apologies these hon. gentlemen are making will be construed into sympathy with the contractors in their attempts to debase the electorate. I have great pleasure in supporting this resolution; and I hope the House will see that rigid measures are adopted for correcting all attempts to corrupt the electors, and for maintaining the purity of our elections for all time to come.

Mr. VALIN. I am glad the hon. member referred to the corruption of contractors in Quebec. I remember that, as the hon. member for L'Islet remarked, there are some members here who should not be here, because they were elected by contractors' money. The hon. gentleman should have given names. I saw lots of people repairing the walls of the city of Quebec who were paid by the Government contractor, if not by the Government themselves, and engaged with the special agreement that they would support the candidate of the Government of the day. I have seen contractors paying money to carters on the condition that they would vote for the Government candidate, or else other carters would be employed. There was also a large sum of money that I know of—I could give the amount—spent at Point Levis to elect the Government candidate there. I do not see why the hon. member for L'Islet comes now with such a Bill before the House. He should have had it passed at the time I refer to, when he was also a member of this House. Then would have been the proper time; and then, under it, the city of Quebec would have been put in gaol. I am opposed to this amendment because I do not think it comes in a proper time.

Mr. MOFFAT. The hon. member for West Middlesex has chosen to act the part of a resurrectionist by reviving slanders against the party in power; but many slanders could be revived against the party that had power previous to 1878, that were more glaring than anything that could be said against the Conservative party. I know perfectly well of one instance when the then First Minister, standing upon the square here, said to a claimant against the Government: "Your county never gives us a vote, and that is the reason I will not entertain an examination into your claim." I would like to know if that was not a glaring fraud perpetrated on the country, more glaring even than the Pacific Scandal.

Amendment (Mr. Ross, Middlesex) negatived on the following division:—

## YEAH :

## Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fleming,	Mulock,
Auger,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain,	Gillmor,	Pickard,
Bernier,	Gunn,	Platt,
Blake,	Harley,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Innis,	Ross (Middlesex),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Catudal,	Laurier,	Vail,
Charlton,	McMillan (Huron),	Watson,
Cockburn,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Cook,	McIntyre,	Wheler, and
Dupont,	McIsaac,	Wilson.—49.
Fisher,		

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Allison,	Dugas,	McLellan,
Amyot,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	McNeill,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fortin,	Méhot,
Beaty,	Foster,	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Benson,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

Bergeron,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	O'Brien,
Billy,	Girouard (Kent),	Orton,
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Ouimet,
Bowell,	Grandbois,	Paint,
Brecken,	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Cameron (Inverness),	Guillet,	Reid,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hackett,	Richey,
Campbell (Victoria),	Haggart,	Robertson (Hastings),
Carling,	Hall,	Rykert,
Caron,	Hay,	Scott,
Cimon,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Cochrane,	Hilliard,	Small,
Colby,	Homer,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Jamieson,	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Kinney,	Valin,
Daly,	Kranz,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	Labrosse,	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	Lesage,	Wallace (York),
De Beaujeu,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Williams,
Desjardins,	Macmaster,	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westm'land), and
Dodd,	McGreevy,	Wright.—90.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

## PUNISHMENT OF ADULTERY, SEDUCTION, &amp;c.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved that Bill (No. 13) to provide for the punishment of adultery, seduction, and like offences, be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to add to clause four the following words:—"Proving the offence to have been committed."

Mr. CHARLTON. This would simply make the Bill a mockery. The clause reads as follows:—

In any case arising under section one, two or three of this Act, the testimony of the female in respect of 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.

The amendment proposed would simply amount to annulling the evidence of the woman by making the corroborative evidence positive. It would render the Bill inoperative. There is not a Statute in any one of the twenty-two American States dealing with this matter which contains any such provision as the one suggested. The Bill as it stands contains a safeguard with respect to the person charged with the offences that is found in none of these Statutes, namely: that the defendant shall be a witness in his own behalf. The rights of the community have been as carefully guarded as possible, and if the House wish to defeat the Bill, it would be more honorable to do so squarely than in a roundabout fashion.

Mr. BLAKE. I must concur in the observations of my hon. friend from North Norfolk. The clause goes far beyond what was stated by the hon. member for Victoria to be his object. He said the offence consisted of two ingredients: the seduction and the promise of marriage, and that the corroborative evidence might only relate to one of the two. But what he proposes is a clause which provides, in fact, that the whole case must be completely proved, irrespective of the evidence of the woman. That I understand to be the meaning of corroborative evidence proving the offence to have been committed. There is, therefore, to be evidence that shall be provable adequately for the conviction, proving the offence to be committed independent of the woman's evidence at all. That seems to me to be highly objectionable, to be more than is required in any of those cases, that I am aware of, in which there has been a requirement of corroborative evidence at all. It is contrary to what we understand the meaning of corroborative evidence to be. Corroborative evidence is strengthening evidence; evidence which strengthens the principal testimony, additional evidence in the same direction; but by the definition which the hon. member proposes to make in this amendment, it is quite clear that although it is called