

Hon. Mr. POWER—I am not in sympathy with the clause.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—This is a meaningless clause, in my judgment. It means nothing, and will only lead to any amount of trouble.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not think the clause is open to that objection. I do not see why a prize fight might not be sometimes a very proper sort of entertainment; but the point is simply this, that this amendment extends the definition to a case where the boxers wear gloves, and if they are fighting for money I do not suppose the fact that they wear gloves of a certain weight really makes very much difference in the objectionable nature of the encounter—that is to those who think that such encounters are objectionable.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It certainly would abolish the manly art of self defense with most justices who would seek to put an interpretation upon that clause. There is no good reason why what is ordinarily termed an exhibition fight with gloves should not take place. So far as the practice is concerned, I understand they determine it very largely by the weight of the gloves; but there should be something to indicate that it is not intended to cover an ordinary exhibition between two boxers with gloves. I should like some explanation.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—I confess that I thought I would have here some explanatory notes to each clause of this Bill. Perhaps we had better let it stand for the present. I see the right hon. gentleman is here now.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I think the words 'prize fight' would probably determine what the meaning is, whether that fight takes place with or without gloves.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—No, because it describes what is a prize fight.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—A prize fight is advertised as a prize fight, not an exhibition of the science of boxing at all.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It says: any encounter between two men, by previous arrangement, with gloves, and all boxing

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex).

matches are encounters between two parties with gloves by previous arrangement, and would be a prize fight. Surely we have not arrived at that very sanctimonious state of life when if two men, by previous arrangement, put on gloves to have an encounter, it must be termed a prize fight and come within the criminal law.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—Does it not mean a fight for gain or for some consideration? I do not understand the game at all. I never had the gloves on but once, when I was a lad; but would not it mean a contest or an encounter where there was some gain?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—It does not say so.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—I do not know anything about it.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—If my hon. friend will look at clause 31, any encounter between two men, by previous arrangement, with gloves, is a prize fight. An ordinary boxing match under the terms of this clause would be a prize fight.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—It is felt that these exhibitions of boxing to which the public are admitted are demoralizing—I am only surmising from some correspondence I had with the Humane Society—and that it is desirable to abolish all exhibitions of boxing, with or without gloves. The presumption is that if boxing is with gloves, it is harmless, and nobody gets hurt, and if it is without gloves it is more serious; but that it is bad and demoralizing in any case, and I apprehend the intent of this clause is to prohibit all exhibitions of anything like a prize fight between two persons, either with or without gloves. That is all I can say about it. It does not help anybody, I admit.

The clause was allowed to stand.

On clause 123.

"123. Every one who carries about his person any bowie-knife, dagger, dirk, metal knuckles, skull crackers, slung shot, or other offensive weapon of a like character, or secretly carries about his person any instrument loaded at the end, or sells or exposes for sale, publicly or privately, any such weapon; or, being masked or disguised, carries or has in his possession any firearm or air gun, is