

second, or aiding, a fine not over \$1000, and imprisonment to hard labor not more than two years—in Pennsylvania, for challenging or bearing a challenge, a fine not over \$500 and imprisonment of one year—in Delaware, for fighting a duel, or sending, bearing or accepting a challenge, or aiding therein, a fine of \$1000, imprisonment for three months and absolute disqualification for office—in Virginia, for killing in a duel, death; for challenging or accepting a challenge, disqualification for office—in Louisiana, for an insult, with an intent to provoke a challenge, a fine of \$50 to \$300, and close imprisonment from five to thirty days; for giving or accepting a challenge, imprisonment from two to six months, and suspension of political rights for four years; for fighting without wounding, imprisonment from six to twelve months, and suspension from political rights six years; for wounding, but not mortally, or so as to occasion a permanent bodily disability, imprisonment from twelve to eighteen months, and suspension from political rights eight years; for killing in a duel, imprisonment from two to four years and absolute suspension of certain political rights. In many States it is either murder or manslaughter by the general law: Illinois, and some other States, require certain officers to make oath that they have not, within a certain time, been, or will not be concerned in a duel.

Having seen the punishments and laws for the suppression and prevention of duelling, your committee turned their attention to an analysis of the principles upon which it is founded. The principles of honor adorn the character of man, and animate in the pursuit of what is noble and excellent; but when not *properly directed*, are productive of the worst consequences. The object of the duellist is entirely personal, being either to gratify passion or to avoid the imputations of cowardice;—he is, therefore, *selfish*, and the means by which he attains his object are contrary to law, reason and religion, for he takes the law in his own hand, and acts as judge in his own cause. On account of some unguarded word, or trifling offence, he risks his own life, and involves, perhaps, in wretchedness, a wife and family, who depend on him for subsistence. If he is reminded of these circumstances, of forgiveness, patience and forbearance, he claims the right of revenge with the ferocity of a savage; and thus duelling is supported by pride—for *honor*, in its fashionable sense, is pride modified by whimsical rules. Your committee cannot forbear to quote the words of Paley on this subject; he says:—"The law of honor is a system of rules constructed by people of fashion, and calculated to facilitate their intercourse with one another, and for no other purpose. It prescribes and regulates the duties betwixt equals, *omitting* such as relate to the Supreme Being, as well as those which we owe to our inferiors. For which reason, profaneness, neglect of public worship or private devotion, cruelty to servants, rigorous treatment of tenants or other dependants, want of charity to the poor, injury done to tradesmen by insolvencies, or delay of payment, with