

PUGILISTIC EXHIBITIONS.

The enterprising Crown Attorney for this judicial district has unearthed the fact that our civic authorities are in the habit of granting licenses for pugilistic exhibitions, and has written a letter to the mayor sharply protesting against the practice. Mr. Fenton is right, and public opinion will sustain him in the stand he has taken. These so-called sparring matches under the Marquis of Queensbury rules are neither more nor less than thinly disguised prize fights which are now illegal in England and the United States, as well as Canada. The gloves used are mere apologies for boxing gloves, and there is on the part of each contestant as determined a purpose to use up his antagonist by blows, and to inflict injury upon him, as there is in the case of a regular prize-ring fight with the bare hands.

The Dominion Parliament recently and very properly made the law against prize fights much more stringent than it used to be, so much so that to be a spectator of such a contest is now almost as dangerous as to be a participator in it. This is as it should be. There would be few ring contests were it not for the crowds they draw, and the amount of money which changes hands amongst the betting spectators. But in Toronto pugilistic exhibitions, our policemen and detectives have been always amongst the crowd, whether to sympathize with merit or to see that the rules were observed does not appear. The first duty of the authorities is obviously to stop licensing such brutal exhibitions, and the next is to suppress them altogether. If men want to spar for amusement let them do it in the privacy of their own homes or clubs, and not lower Toronto to the moral level of New York or Chicago, by pounding and bruising each other for either stake or gate money.

- Since the above was put in type, Mayor Boswell has announced that a stop will be put to these disgusting exhibitions. We hope Mr. Manning will see that this pledge is redeemed.

Contributed Articles.

To the Editor of THE CANADA CITIZEN.

DEAR SIR,—A long period of sickness has prevented my saying many things to your readers with regard to the cause of woman suffrage that have been in my heart; being a little better just now, I beg to call their attention once more to what I think to be the duty of all women with regard to this question in respect of temperance. The W. C. T. U. in every part of the Dominion is, I believe, working faithfully, but as a whole, looks askance at the woman suffragists. This is because the W. C. T. U. of the United States, led by Miss Frances Willard, some few years ago thought it best to keep their work entirely separate from that of woman suffrage. No doubt the ladies of the United States were right in their judgment, but I do not think their conclusions with regard to their own affairs should govern Canadian women. Our mode of government is quite different to that of the United States, both in parts and as a whole; therefore it is necessary that we should consider our own circumstances and come to our own conclusions as to what is best for ourselves. And I do not for my part think it is best for temperance organizations to look upon suffrage organizations as, in some degree at least, inimical, and entirely injurious to the cause, as they appear to do at present. I believe that thereby the temperance organizations do themselves an injury, and omit to avail themselves of advantages put in their way. A case in point is this. By the exertions of the Canadian Woman Suffrage Association and their friends in the Ontario Legislature and elsewhere, the municipal suffrage has been given to all duly qualified women throughout the Province. This gives these women the right to use their vote for such control of the liquor traffic, as is possessed by the various town and county councils: a great power, and one that rightly used may be of the almost advantage to the W. C. T. U. in whatever direction it chooses to work.

But if we said to them, as we do, "The municipal suffrage for women is not enough, they must have the parliamentary franchise throughout the Dominion," I do not think I am wrong in saying that by far the larger proportion of the members of the W. C. T. U. throughout the Province, would not only look coldly, but speak discouragingly, if not inimically, in that regard.

And yet without the parliamentary franchise we women cannot vote for the Scott Act.

Suppose we had been in possession of that franchise during the past year, is it not morally certain that no failures would have been recorded anywhere? I think so; and I think the workers for the Scott Act would say so too. It is plain, at any rate, that the possession of the parliamentary franchise by women would be of immense service to temperance workers, and therefore I ask them all, but especially the women, to remember this, and whenever they can give their voices in favor of the parliamentary franchise for women, to do so, and thus assist those who are working for it, by building up a correct sentiment on the subject, while at the same time they are helping themselves forward many steps in the direction in which they desire to go.

I do not advocate a union of forces. I do not think either association would be a gainer by it; all I ask is a correct estimate of the value of woman suffrage to the temperance cause, and a friendly attitude towards it on the part of our Women's Temperance Unions.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

SARAH ANNE CURZON,
President C. W. S. A.

THE SLANDER ABOUT BANGOR.

GALT, Jan. 6th, 1885.

MR. EDITOR,—Many of your readers saw the letters on Prohibition in Maine published by E. King Dodds in the *Toronto Mail* in 1877, and repeated in the *Globe* in 1884. These were sent to Rev. Enoch Pond, D.D., Principal of the Congregational Seminary, Bangor, Maine, by Rev. Hugh Pedley, B.A., of Cobourg. I append a verbatim copy of his reply, the original of which I have in my possession, and have used it repeatedly in controversies with Mr. Dodds much to his discomfort.

Yours truly,

A. M. PHILLIPS.

BANGOR, Sept. 7th, 1877

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—The day I received your letter we had a Temperance Convention here, and I sent in your extract from the *Toronto Mail* that our friend might see what was said about us in Canada. It was condemned as being little better than a tissue of lies. I have read the whole column more than once. It is artfully written, but calculated throughout to make wrong impressions. I have lived in Bangor 45 years and know pretty well what it was once and what it is now. There has been almost a total change. Formerly everybody drank, and drunkenness staggered about our streets. Now few people drink at all, and really I have not seen a drunken man in our streets for years. A few poor miserable creatures drink when they can get it, and are brought before the Police Court, and are fined or shut up, and if you read the names, you will see that they are frequently the same persons. The reason why more are indicted now than in former years is, that now everybody who sells or drinks is hunted up, formerly almost nobody was prosecuted, none unless they got into a row and made disturbance. In short, the prohibitory law connected with much earnest persuasion has wrought wonders. It has been a glorious success. No party in Maine wants it repealed. Some of the Democrats introduced a resolution into their Convention lately to repeal it, and it was thrown out with hisses. The Republicans are nearly all its friends. I long to see the system introduced into Canada and all the British Provinces. You would see the good result of it in better houses, better fences, better farms, better traders and mechanics, and a better state of society. Why should it not be so? All that is spent in strong drink is more than thrown away, and brains, and character, and comfort, and happiness are thrown away with it.

Yours with much respect,

ENOCH POND.