

witness of a prize fight, at least we have a right to suppose that he is telling us something from his own knowledge. I have not the slightest doubt that he has seen a prize fight, because he is a pertinacious sort of fighting man. He never gives up his point. If he has anything on his mind he lugs it in by the head and shoulders on all occasions. We have heard a good deal of his views on temperance and sobriety. The trouble with the member for Annapolis is, that he is scarcely a sober or a temperate man. He is not charitable. He forgets the lessons that were laid down by our Saviour: he does not understand that you are to cast the mantle of charity around your neighbors, that you are to accord to others holding different opinions from your own the same degree of liberality that you claim for yourself. I know that the member for Annapolis thinks that I am so far steeped in the gall of iniquity that I am not fit to associate with him in the dark, but only in a House like this. To tell the honest truth, in old days when men were influenced by the strong hand, when those hereditary predatory robbers—that the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) described as the ancestors of the leader of the Government and the Speaker of the Senate—wrought their will among their fellows, there was something of manliness among them after all. Do not understand me to be saying anything in favor of the degrading spectacle of prize fighting, which must be so shocking that I am sure if the member for Annapolis has seen one he will never go to another. But in the old fighting days, when men contended by the strength of their hands on a fair field in the characteristic manner of Englishmen of the olden time, there was something better and more manly than the way warfare is conducted now. We see melancholy examples of what things have grown to in this polite and gentle age. We see men on the floor of this House, even, within a few feet of each other, call each other liars, and have it disseminated through the press; call each other thieves, charge each other with every base crime and have it circulated far and wide through the country; and yet, in a short time afterwards, they will get up in a most parliamentary manner and declare that they said nothing of the kind—that their words were not intended to bear this construction at all. There was nothing of this kind in the good old days. It is not so long since that an old fashioned fight absorbed the attention of both sides of the Atlantic, when the Americans, the mighty descendants of our own mother land, thought they would tackle her at her favorite mode of settling disputes on her own soil, and it was recorded by one of their own poets that:

"The fancy of America
By all creation swore,
The British champion round his loins
The belt should wear no more;
They chose a man straightway,
And felt his arm, and saw him hit,
And leaped and cheered, cursed and spit,
And sent him to the fray."

Such was the idea then; but, unfortunately, anything of good there was in the manliness with which those old fights were conducted is done away with now, and a different mode of warfare has supervened. As related by another poet, talking of this same thing:

"The belt which once the champion graced,
When boxing honor reigned,
In modern time has been disgraced,
And all its glory stained."

The quicker we can do away with these disgusting exhibitions the better; the quicker we can arrange to settle our disputes by some other means than by fighting them out by mere brute force the better it will be for society. Had the hon. member for Annapolis looked into the matter a little farther he would not have got up, in the prosecution of his favorite hobby, and characterized that as an

argument in favor of total abstinence, because I have read something in books and papers to the effect that people who indulge in prize fighting are exceedingly temperate; in fact, the training they are obliged to go through enforces temperance upon them, and they are unable to drink, leading, I suppose, in that respect better lives than either the member of Annapolis or myself. I will conclude these remarks by asking the member for Annapolis, who improves all occasions to air his special opinion, to have a little more regard for the opinions of men who do not look on things exactly as he does. He is a good party-man, a good Conservative, a man whom I respect in the highest degree, and I only wish he would be a little more reasonable, a little more charitable, and a little more temperate in the expression of his opinions.

Mr. LONGLEY. I do not propose for a moment to follow the hon. member who has just sat down in the spirit of banter in which he has chosen to indulge, for I would have to confess, before I began, that in that respect I could not hope to be any match for him. But his remarks have suggested to me an idea, which I did not consider it necessary to elaborate when I was on my feet before. We know what broils, growing out of intemperance, are witnessed around the grogeries. Many men, infuriated with liquor that will kill at forty rods—I will not say that the hon. member who has just sat down is a strenuous advocate of it, because he would probably require good liquor—these men, made absolutely insane, poisoned and embittered, are not content with using their fists. They are rather fonder of using the knife, and sometimes, unfortunately, they go the length of killing. Is the hon. gentleman unacquainted with the fact that, in the estimation, not of temperance advocates, but of men connected with his own profession—Judges, leading members of the Bar, Attorney Generals and State prosecutors—men in the most favorable positions for witnessing all the iniquity and all the terrible results which flow from the traffic—nine-tenths of the crime which they are called upon to adjudicate upon, result either directly or indirectly from the traffic in intoxicating liquors. The hon. gentleman has done me an injustice, although I feel that I can stand it. I can inform him that I have never witnessed a pugilistic encounter. I am not the man to encourage such exhibitions. My associations have been widely different, I am happy to say. To one observation of the hon. gentleman I wish to draw his attention, and also the attention of others who are under the delusion that intoxicants impart strength and vigor to a man who engages in such encounters. He has informed us that those men who are degrading enough to pommel one another until they are not recognizable, are nevertheless notable for their temperance principles, if not in the main, at least in preparation for the encounter. Does not that sweep away the nonsense that is talked about intoxicating liquors imparting vigor to the system, and prove that a man is better without the inebriating draught than with it? This is not true alone, with regard to the men who train for pugilistic encounters, but also with regard to men who train for foot races, and men who have to undergo any continuous fatigue. These are facts, not because I give utterance to them, but they are facts which are proved from a knowledge of the properties of alcohol, from the fact that it cannot assimilate with the human system, that no nourishment can be derived from it, according to the testimony of the most eminent physicians, not in the Dominion alone, but all over the world. If the hon. gentleman will, the first opportunity he has, tell us what good intoxicating liquors have, I shall be better pleased with his statement than with the banter he has seen fit to indulge in on the observations I have made.

Mr. PLUMB. I think one of the peculiar characteristics of the advocates of temperance, is the great intemperance