

people who, themselves accustomed to drink, had sought to abolish certain recognized evils, knowing well what the established course of Dominion prohibitory laws had been. They received with surprise and some dismay the new conditions now arising.

Its legal defects becoming evident we have the Order-in-Council attacked by Mr. Davis in a coming Appeal. Pending its replacement by just and proper legislation, let us pray that success attends Mr. Davis. It will mean the escape in one direction of undoubtedly guilty parties (to be caught in another, we hope) but it will end a great injustice to Prohibition and its supporters and a still greater one to those who come within the reach of the Act.

The situation thus created was further muddled by Findlay's escapade. The suddenness of this gave it a false importance that will die away as the truth comes to light. Practically it only means the not uncommon failure of a man of purely average intellect to meet an extremely difficult situation.

Certain laxity on the part of the Provincial Government, resulting in a partial paralysis in the investigations after Findlay's delinquency was discovered, made people suspicious that "others" and "higher-ups" were involved. The abundant presence of illicit liquor dealing in Vancouver deepened this suspicion. That the Gold Seal-Western Canada Liquor - Gartshore - Tulk - Guinness combination with others, such as McConnon-Smith and the former owners of the Waverley Hotel, were illegally bringing liquor into Vancouver and disposing of it — presumably without Findlay's knowledge; much less consent—was never

hinted at. Naturally it was all blamed on Findlay and the Government. The latter was criticized for not knowing what they could not directly know.

Why the existence of large stores of liquor; of a large illicit sale of liquor was not known to the Government and the City Authorities I neither know—nor is it my purpose to discuss. I am simply interested in pointing out how the Findlay matter, due to its time setting, received an attention much beyond its deserts.

Bad as have been the bewildering effects of the Findlay matter on the general public, it was by no means minimized by the resolutions on the subject passed at the last Convention. These resolutions in part seem to blame the local Administration for defects in the carrying out of our Act due solely to the Order-in-Council, thus strengthening a wrong impression of the Act. They also make demands as to Findlay talking, which seem to me, even from the narrow standpoint of Criminal Law, ill-considered and quite absurd. In saying this I am not posing as any legal authority. I have very often been mistaken, and sincerely hope I am in this.

In touching on the third and last element in the situation—the injustices in regard to the Act—I shall at present refer only to two. The first I will call the Hotel provision. By its effect I could, apart from the Order-in-Council, have stored in my dwelling such liquor as I wished—because I was fortunate enough to own a dwelling. It was to me a useless privilege—but I had it. Clients of mine who have lived in and around Vancouver, but whose only home in Vancouver was a certain hotel where they stayed consistently year after