

(8) That due recognition be given to the fact that the Prohibition Party is fortunate in having a Vancouver daily paper supporting the cause. That at the same time the fullest use be made of all other newspapers and publications in the province, as it may be assumed that the press generally—unless it be “tied” to the liquor interests, as saloons have been known to be tied to breweries—will seek to be fair in the news reported and publicity given concerning the prohibition movement.

(9) That the dilly-dallying methods and manoeuvring tactics of politicians be avoided, and, through careful and thorough organization, a straight appeal made to the people of the province for support in carrying the campaign to a successful issue.

(10) That unless the present or any other possible British Columbia Government is prepared to give the Prohibition Party “a square deal” and a decision on the basis of a simple majority of a clean and untampered-with electors’ roll, the whole organized strength of the men and women behind the prohibition movement be directed to placing in power in British Columbia a Government—no matter of what party name or composition—which will recognize that we live in a democratic country, part of the British Empire, in the twentieth century, and that under the British Crown a Government’s duty is not to manipulate and manoeuvre for place and power, but to carry out the will of the people.

The Lucas Case Criticism

An up-country correspondent and former subscriber takes us to task for our criticism of the Lucas libel case. We are not informed on what basis of knowledge or authority or under what inspiration (if any) this gentleman takes exception to our comments, but we welcome his communication because it suggests that he has a wholesome respect for judges and courts.

Our correspondent may be surprised to know that upbringing and residence in another part of the British Empire and some professional experience in a Supreme Court there, have so strengthened within us a similar respect, that, though our vocabulary is adequate for most purposes, we found it somewhat difficult to express in King’s English the impression left upon us by what we heard in Court concerning the case mentioned.

Far be it from us to question or impugn for a moment the fitness or honour or unbiased attitude of any judge acting under the British Crown; but we believe that any journal may with candour criticize any judgment passed by any court in these realms.

We wish our correspondent to know that so far from seeking to be “contumacious” in our review of the case, our expression of criticism was modified by former legal experience and training which taught us to hold all British judges as “above suspicion,” and all courts as entitled to respect not only from journalistic critics, but even from those against whom they may decide cases.

In our criticism of the Lucas libel case we believe we made one mistake: we accepted the judgment as final, as it indeed was—for the time being. We do not know what the procedure would be in British Columbia if such a case is appealed, but we hope it is permissible to express the wish that it were possible for that case to be referred, as might be done in Scotland, to a court of four or five other judges—corresponding to what is known as the “First” or “Second Division” of the Court of Session—the Supreme Court there. Then might follow a “hearing,” when the evidence taken in the “Outer House” or lower court, would be reviewed by counsel on each side and commented upon by the four