

an athletic institution in Canada that has not those exhibitions from time to time, encounters made by previous arrangement, precisely within the language of the section.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—This clause is not a new one.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—They have added 'with gloves'.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—The only words added are 'either with, or without gloves'. The Interpretation Act gave the definition of a prize fight; it was:

"Prize fight means an encounter or a fight with fists or hands."

Now it reads:

"With fists or hands, either with or without gloves, between two persons who have met for such purpose by previous arrangement and so on."

If there be any principle in the change it is that a prize fight is now, instead of being simply an encounter or fight with fists or hands, an encounter or fight either with or without gloves.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUÉ—By reason of the addition of these words 'With or without gloves.' I think it will be necessary to add after the word 'gloves,' the following:—

"Other than ordinary boxing matches."

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Has there been any abuse of the law as it exists? There has not been a prize fight in Canada for years and years.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—The hon. gentleman is in error. There have been a good many prize fights, some clandestinely I will admit, and some openly, in and around Montreal.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE—I entirely agree with the hon. leader of the opposition; it is a manly thing to fight, thoroughly English, and I was brought up to it myself. I cannot see why they should stop people from fighting with gloves.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—A fight may be a manly thing, but a prize fight is a disgusting exhibition.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Can the hon. gentleman mention any case which has been brought before the court of a prosecution for a prize fight in Canada?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not see that there is anything more objectionable in a boxing match than there is in a Rugby football game. It is not nearly as dangerous.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—It is not uncommon for roughs to cross at Fort Erie and hold fights right there, when they could not hold them in the State of New York, I know that is a fact.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Can my hon. friend point to any prosecution of that nature that has taken place in Ontario? My attention has not been directed to it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—I know we had some difficulty in trying to break up these exhibitions.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It is a fact there have been arrangements made in Buffalo for prize fights to take place in Fort Erie; but in every instance the authorities have put a stop to it under the law as it stands.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—I suppose what is wanted is to prevent these boxing exhibitions with or without gloves, which encourage prize fighting.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED moved to strike out the clause.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—Clause 2 is but an enlargement of the interpretation clause.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Then it will leave the law as it stands.

The motion was agreed to and the clause was struck out.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I move the following be inserted as clause 728 A:—

"It shall not hereafter be necessary that a jury shall be unanimous in a criminal case, and a verdict of guilty may be rendered notwithstanding the dissent of one juror."

I may say that a good many years ago I introduced a Bill to this effect, which secured the support of the Senate at that time. When the Criminal Code of 1892 was being considered by a joint committee of the two Houses, of which the hon. member from Richmond was chairman, the committee unanimously recommended a larger change in the law than my amendment involves. They recommended that the dissent of two jurors in the case of a