

The summary of the evidence given in corroboration of the complainant is set out as follows in the stated case: "In January, 1906, she was ill with typhoid fever, and the doctor being called in discovered that she was pregnant and had been so for between 4 and 5 months. She then told the doctor and her mother that the prisoner was the father of her child. This was about the last Friday in January, 1906. That night the mother accused the prisoner. He did not deny it, but said there were others. On the next following Sunday the prisoner said to the father and mother of the girl, who was also present, that he always intended to marry her, and a date was then fixed for the wedding. He knew the condition she was in. Her brother was then ill with typhoid fever in the same house, and the prisoner took the girl up to the brother's room and talked of the intended marriage. The prisoner and the brother had worked together in the round house at Fort William prior to 15th January, 1905, and this brother, William Bates, testified that whilst so working there the prisoner told him that he was fond enough or thought enough of Annie to make her his wife; and that upon a subsequent occasion, the date not being fixed, the prisoner asked William Bates how he would like him for a brother-in-law. The prisoner and the girl, Annie M. Bates, had their photograph taken together on the 5th day of February, 1905, and this is produced and put in as corroborative evidence that he had promised to marry her."

I am of opinion that the foregoing evidence is quite sufficient to satisfy the requirements of sec. 684. Full corroboration is not required. The complainant only needs to be "corroborated in some material particular by evidence implicating the accused." There can be no doubt about the above evidence implicating the accused. It points directly to him and to him alone. And I am equally of opinion that it corroborates the complainant not only in a material particular, but in material particulars. It has been laid down that where there are several issues, and the statute requires "corroboration by some material evidence," it does not mean corroboration on each issue: *Parker v. Parker*, 32 C. P. 113. What is required is corroboration in some material respect that will fortify and strengthen the credibility of the main witness and justify the evidence being accepted and acted upon if it is believed and is sufficient. The corroboration