

Still more detestable is the attempt made to prove absolute and incredible improprieties long after the time when according to natural laws the act of the defendant must have been committed. The doctrine that injury done to a character already very bad is not so great as that done to one that is intact, is no doubt in some cases a sound one; but it applies principally to where the injury complained of is in its nature, an injury to the character itself and not to the person. Here, where the injury done is to the person herself, to her own nature and internal peace; when the world has nothing to do with it, till the event of the birth becomes public; is she to suffer in secret, and at last when she is driven to proceed to law, to be told by her betrayer under a plea of general issue merely, that though there is properly speaking no question of character here at all; and though he has really nothing to say, and apparently thinks that he has nothing to do to repair the wrong he has inflicted he has the right at all events to depreciate his victim? I think not. I consider that this young woman has established a right to damages against her seducer; there is no possibility under the admissions of the defendant himself, of doubting the paternity as a fact; though the form of the action prevents me from adjudging it. There have been attempts at settlement made by defendant and by his father on his behalf, who said that he would give nothing of his own, but would pay out of his son's means. The defendant, therefore, is not without means, and it is proved he has left the country to avoid going into the box as a witness. Considering the dastardly aggravation of offence, by the defendant's attempt to attack the character of the plaintiff, I must give damages that will be substantial to this poor girl though not to the extent the witnesses go. Judgment for \$150 damages; \$50 *frais de gésine*; \$5 a month for first five years, and \$8 for the next nine years and cost of suit.