

rope enacted laws against deciding questions of law and equity by an appeal to deadly weapons, a mode of trial then deluging the nations in blood, especially France and England.

This barbarous system of litigation being repressed, the fighting spirit found vent in the equally absurd appeal to arms in questions of honor, which soon became so fearfully popular, that laws were repeatedly enacted to prevent **BISWORS** from entering the lists! Even the ladies participated in the popular madness! It can be satisfactorily shown, that one woman actually slew **THREE MEN** with the sword in the duel conflict!!! The state of morals became shocking in the extreme. France became so much like a general slaughter-house, that notwithstanding the vigorous efforts of Henry IV. to repress duelling by punishing the crime with death, no less than 4,000 perished in the duel during his reign, while pardons were granted to more than 14,000 for violating the laws against duelling.— The demoralizing influence of this general mania baffles all description, so that we are constrained to express our astonishment at finding men, of this age, daring to apologize for the enormous abomination of duelling.

Being anxious to see the brutal custom abolished forever, I would suggest, with Bacon, that moderate punishments be enacted against the duellist, and not the death penalty; for while death is the penalty every duellist is sure, to escape, without a stigma attached to his CHARACTER.

Let it be enacted, therefore,

1st. That every person sending a challenge shall, on conviction, be doomed an alien for life, to be so held and treated in law to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever.

2d. That any person accepting a challenge shall, on conviction, be deprived of all government office whether of honor or enrollment, and pronounced incapable of holding any such office for the period of seven years, after his acceptance of such challenge.

3d. That seconds accompanying duellists to the field, or to the place of combat, or promoting the duel in any manner, or being in any way accessory thereto, shall, each of them, be doomed to suffer the penalty of the acceptor of a challenge.

4th. That each duellist convicted of actual fighting shall, in addition to the above penalty, be publicly gazetted as a hero in brutality, but in morals an ignoble coward!

5th. That a duellist wounding his antagonist

be compelled to meet all the expenses of a cure, and all the other consequent losses and expenses of his victim, in addition to suffering the above penalties.

6th. That a duellist killing his antagonist shall, on conviction, be compelled to meet the claims of all his creditors, and provide for any dependents which he may have left behind him on earth, by an annual payment of from £5 to £500, according to the ability of the manslayer, which annual payment, when not required as above, shall be paid into the treasury of the Lunatic Asylum, as a yearly remembrancer of his folly and impious madness.

A bill embodying these or similar restrictions, we shall be happy to see enacted during the present session of Parliament, believing that such punishments will be much more efficacious than the death penalty, as well as more equitable and rational.

For information on the subject permit me to refer you to *Medlingen on duelling*, 2 vol. 8 vo London, 1841. For an able article on which, see the *Ed. Review*, 1842, or the *New York Albion* for 1842, pp.'s 467, 479 and 490.

In the Cause of Life,

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT DICK.

MONTEAL, Feb'y 28th, 1849.

MR. EDITOR:—I have had the pleasure of perusing your valuable little journal, and hail it as the pioneer of medical reform in Canada, hoping that it may open the eyes of every Canadian who values his life and liberty, the birthright of every British subject: and I assert, without fear of contradiction, that if the doctors succeed in getting their bill passed, they will deprive us of our just rights and liberties. Shall they oblige us to employ them, that, after they have run through their catalogue of drugs, and failed to relieve the miserable sufferer, they may leave him to die without hope? Many have been brought to this condition and afterward relieved by the Thompsonian remedies. Shall the kind-hearted soul, who relieves the sufferer, be fined and imprisoned for a good deed? In England the brave man who saves a drowning fellow being from a watery grave, is recompensed. Should this be withheld from the benevolent man who saves a poor sufferer from an untimely grave? Canadians! will you support this atrocious monopoly of the doctors? Our Lower Canadian doctors have framed a bill which they will try to have passed this session, and which, for barbarity, leaves yours in