

been made in the interest of the Province it in place of arranging the business as it has been done, the Government had waited for the collection of the debt until times were more prosperous and so the property of increased value."

But the Committee in making this only reserve completely lost sight of the important fact established by the deposition of Mr. Dechene that thus waiting for a very problematic result was rendered impossible by the judicial sale by which the property was menaced on the part of the hypothecary creditors.

This transaction took place 18 years ago.

Ask then our adversaries if the property in question has increased in value since.

Everybody at Quebec knows that the Gowan Farm is worth less to-day, if possible, than in 1879, and the Government would have certainly not have received more interest since than it did before this transaction.

In 1800 a Tory candidate had the impudence to attack the honor of the Opposition Leader. He was at once taken before the Tribunals and here is the judgment given by the Superior Court and confirmed by the Court of Review.

Canada.

SUPERIOR COURT.

Province of Quebec.

District of Iberville.

Monday the third day of February, 1893.

The Honorable Charles Gill, Judge.

No. 54.

Felix Gabriel Marchand, Esq., Notary of the town of St. John in the district of Iberville. Plaintiff.

VS.

Jacques S. Mollieur, manufacturer of the same place. Defendant.

The Court having heard the testimony and pleadings of the advocates engaged in the case decided:

Whereas the plaintiff claimed of the defendant \$25,000 damages on account of libel cited hereafter; the defendant pleading justification;

Whereas the litigants were opposing candidates at the Provincial elections held in March last, in the county of St. Johns.

Considering that the defendant has published at St. John's an address to the electors, in two languages, which was scattered throughout the county and

widely read by a large number of persons; the English version being as follows:

THE FIRST BOODLING.

Mr. Marchand is the first to have dared to commit an act which to-day would be termed boodling, in selling to the benefit of Mr. Jolys brother-in-law for \$5,000, the claims of the Government of the Province of Quebec had on the Gowan Farm and the Bickell bridge, amounting to \$17,000, thus making a present to the brother of the then Prime Minister of \$12,000. This was the first boodling committed in Quebec, as was proved by the Committee of Enquiry. The defendant thus exhumed an old political incident which had been disposed of by a Parliamentary Committee, the members of which had unanimously acquitted the plaintiff from all dishonesty in the transaction regarding the farm at Notre Dame des Anges.

Considering that the defendant knew the committee's report, that he knew that the plaintiff was in no way guilty of malversation in this affair, that he himself had supported the candidature of the plaintiff in one if not two elections held since, that he in calling the action of the plaintiff boodling, and giving the name of boodler to the plaintiff he knew that he accused him falsely of dishonesty in his administration of public affairs whilst Minister of Crown Lands.

Considering that in publishing the said pamphlet the defendant had the malicious intention of injuring the plaintiff in making the electors believe that he was a "boodler," and as a consequence that he was guilty of malversation, of theft in the sense defined above,—the sense that the defendant wished to give to the pamphlet in his defence not being that understood in such a way, by anyone.

Considering that the plaintiff is a public man of absolute integrity and that his reputation for honesty has been proverbial during a long political career, in the course of which he has been a member of the Executive Council of the Province of Quebec and Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, and that he has the right to apply to the justice of his country in order to obtain redress for the great wrong which the defendant has done him, he shall have a verdict the amount of which will not be disproportionate as compared with the insult launched at him and of the position of the man who has inflicted it, the defendant being a rich man who has made his fortune by his work, who has twice