

THE LEGAL NEWS.

VOL. XVII.

JANUARY 1, 1894.

No. 1.

CURRENT TOPICS AND CASES.

There are many who would refuse to apply to public persons a term so well understood as "thief," who yet do not hesitate to refer to them as "boodlers," a slang expression, "affecting," as the learned Chief Justice of the Superior Court happily expressed it, "to harmonize the comical and the infamous." Yet, it being proved that this term, so freely used in the newspapers and in private conversation, has acquired a definite meaning, and that "boodling" actually designates a species of thieving—the filching, by some means or other, by the "boodler" of that which does not belong to him—the Courts cannot refuse to recognize the defamatory character of the term, nor hesitate to hold that an action lies for the use of it. Such was the decision of the Court of Review at Montreal, Nov. 4, 1893, in *Marchand v. Molleur*, unanimously affirming the judgment of Gill, J., in the Superior Court, which awarded \$500 damages for the unjustifiable application of this term to the leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec.

Oscillatory legislation, it need hardly be observed, does not add to the dignity of the legislative body, or to its reputation for wisdom. The period of study prescribed