

THE TARBORO' PRESS.

Whole No 1016.

Tarborough, Edgecombe County, N. C. Wednesday, August 27, 1845.

Vol. VII. No. 34.

The Tarborough Press, By GEORGE HOWARD, JR.

Is published weekly at Two Dollars per year if paid in advance—or, Two Dollars and Fifty Cents at the expiration of the subscription year. Subscribers are at liberty to discontinue at any time on giving notice thereof and paying arrears. Advertisements not exceeding a square will be inserted at One Dollar the first insertion, and 25 cents for every continuance. Longer advertisements at that rate per square. Court Orders and Judicial Advertisements 25 per cent. higher. Advertisements must be marked the number of insertions required, or they will be continued until otherwise directed, and charged accordingly. Letters addressed to the Editor must be post paid, or they may not be attended to.

DR. D. JAYNE'S Family Medicines.

THESE medicines are recommended and extensively used by the most intelligent persons in the United States, by numerous Professors and Presidents of Colleges, Physicians of the Army and Navy, and of Hospitals and Almshouses, and by more than five hundred Clergymen of various denominations.

They are expressly prepared for family use, and have acquired an unprecedented popularity throughout the United States; and as they are so admirably calculated to preserve HEALTH and cure DISEASE, no family should ever be without them. The proprietor of these valuable preparations received his education at one of the best Medical Colleges in the United States, and has had twenty years experience in an extensive and diversified practice, by which he has had ample opportunities of acquiring a practical knowledge of diseases, & of the remedies best calculated to remove them.

Names and Prices of Dr. D. Jayne's Family Medicines, viz:

Jayne's Expectant, per bottle,	\$1 00
" Hair Tonic " " "	1 00
" ALTERNATIVE or Life Preservative, per btl.	1 00
" Tonic Vermifuge " " "	0 50
" Carminative Balsam, 25 and 50	
" Sanative Pills, per box,	0 25
" American Hair Dye,	0 50

All the above mentioned Medicines are prepared ONLY by Dr. D. Jayne. Inventor and Sole Proprietor, No. 20 South Third Street, Philadelphia, Pa. who has no hesitation in recommending them to the community as preparations worthy of their entire confidence, and is fully persuaded from past experience, that they will be found eminently successful in removing those diseases for which they are severally recommended. For sale in Tarboro' by

JAS. M. REDMOND, Agent.

July 12, 1845

Jayne's Ague Pills,

Are WARRANTED to make a perfect and lasting cure of Fever and Ague.

These Pills are put up in vials containing from 25 to 30 Pills each, and being thus excluded from the air, never deteriorate or undergo any change, and are WARRANTED, if used according to the directions, to be an INFALLIBLE REMEDY for

Fever and Ague.

During twelve years extensive Practice in a low marshy district of country, where Fever and Agues were very prevalent, the Proprietor was always enabled to effect radical cures, of the most inveterate cases, by the use of these Pills.

Messrs. Jayne & Pancoast of St. Louis Mo., found these Pills so uniformly successful in curing Fever and Ague, that they sold several hundred bottles to various persons in Missouri, Illinois, &c., agreeing to return money in all cases where they failed to effect a cure, and such was the universal satisfaction the Pills gave of their value that they were never called upon to refund for a single bottle.

These Pills may also be used in all cases where a tonic or strengthening medicine may be required. Prepared only by Dr. D. JAYNE, No. 8 South Third Street, Philadelphia.

JAS. M. REDMOND, Agent.

Tarboro', July 12, 1845.



Dr. Duffy's ANTI-BILIOUS PILLS AND TONIC MIXTURE.

JUST RECEIVED, a supply of Dr. Duffy's Anti-bilious Pills and Tonic Mixture, an effectual remedy for Ague and Fever, &c.

GEO. HOWARD, Agent.

Tarboro', July 16.

Constables' Blanks for sale,
AT THIS OFFICE.

POLITICAL.

FOR THE TARBORO' PRESS.

TO THE PUBLIC.

The necessity which compels a man to appear before the Public, in a matter of a private nature, is always to be deeply regretted. A man's feelings are so apt to magnify the importance of matters which concern himself individually, whilst a large portion of the public are disposed to amuse themselves at his very anxiety and concern, that it is often better to endure in silence some temporary irritation, rather than by writing to prolong a controversy, which after months of labor will perhaps be no nearer to an end than when it first commenced. No consideration therefore could now induce me to appear before the public but an apprehension, lest silence under the circumstances might be construed into an admission of the truth of all which has been written by that blustering braggart, H. F. HARRISS. It seems, that although "HE" participated in the late Duel, avowedly because of his personal and political friendship for "Mr. Dimock"; his real object was to acquire glory for himself, and having failed to obtain that by his conduct on the field, he has tried his luck upon paper. And as if conscious least his own ability might prove inadequate to so great a task, he has called to his assistance, Dr. Charles Bell Gibson, whose notions of justice and propriety are such as to allow him to give testimony, only on the side from which he has received pay. For in a letter to Dr. Gibson I politely requested an answer to certain interrogatories, which he has failed to answer although so ready to laud the virtues of the party from which he receives "pay and provender". How miserably does his conduct contrast, in this respect with that of Dr. May. So far as his knowledge extends, Dr. May is ready to answer questions put to him by either party. More of this however, in the sequel.

A pompous publication has been issued, from the other side and the avowed excuse for lugging such matters before the public, is, first, because of the existence of many & conflicting and false reports, in circulation, concerning the recent duel and, secondly, because (as HARRISS alleges,) he "made a call upon me and informed me of the rumors and requested me to give a statement in writing, of the facts as they occurred on the field, and I failed to furnish any statement whatever". That there should have been many and conflicting, as well as false reports, in circulation about the affair, we are all most ready to admit and believe. For when did an affair of the kind ever come off, but what conflicting and false reports were put in circulation about it? And when did it ever occur that these reports did not purport to emanate from some of the parties immediately engaged in the transaction? An indiscreet friend of one party makes his tale and circulates it—an indiscreet friend of the other party makes his tale and circulates it; and for the purpose of gaining credit from those to whom it is retailed, each tale is represented to come from some of the parties who were present. This is but natural and constantly occurs in all such cases. Reports in various forms prejudicial both to my friend and self, reached my ears soon after our return. I should have felt however I had embarked in a most crack-brained expedition, if I had set myself to work to find out the origin of these reports and to have attempted to put them all straight. But for the other reason for putting forth HARRISS's publication, to wit, that I had refused to furnish any statement whatever, of what occurred on the field, there is no foundation, for it in truth; but it is entirely and utterly false, as I think the following correspondence will shew.

On the 22nd of July I received from HARRISS, who was then in Washington, N. C., the following letter.

No. 1.

Washington, July 22d, 1845.

Dr. William T. Bryan.
Sir: There are many and conflicting reports in circulation concerning the recent duel between Mr. Clark and Mr. Dimock, all purporting to have emanated from you. These reports are calculated to reflect injuriously upon you, as well as upon Mr. Dimock and myself. It is therefore clearly due to all the parties concerned that you should make a full statement in writing, of

the transactions that occurred on the field, and of the conduct and bearing of the parties while there. Respectfully, &c.

H. F. HARRISS.

To this letter I returned the following note.

No. 2.

Washington, N. C., July 22d, 1845.

Sir: I am fully aware that a number of reports are in circulation, with regard to the recent duel between Mr. Clark and Mr. Dimock, I expected and care very little for them. But if you think it best or wish it, you can make out a statement of facts as they occurred on the field, and as there can be no doubt about them I will take pleasure in signing it with you. Or if you prefer it you can call at my office and confer. Yours respectfully,

WM. T. BRYAN.

Mr. H. F. HARRISS.

In compliance to the invitation contained in this note, HARRISS made out a statement and brought me; but it was so glaringly unjust to my friend and myself, that nothing but the most debased cowardice on my part could have induced me to sign it. HARRISS says in his publication, that I admitted the truth of his statement, but that I was unwilling to sign it because of the absence of Mr. Clark. It is false that I made any such admission, and, in this declaration, I am sustained by the recollection of Dr. J. G. BRYAN.

No. 3.

I hereby certify that I informed Mr. HARRISS that Dr. W. T. Bryan refused to sign the statement drawn up by him (HARRISS) because it did not contain a correct account of the transaction as it occurred on the field. JESSE G. BRYAN.

Unwilling to sign his statement, in my turn, I made out such a one as I was willing to unite with him, in signing. That statement is as follows and was handed HARRISS on the 23rd of July.

No. 4.

Washington, N. C. July 23d, 1845.

As there are various reports in circulation touching the recent duel between Mr. Clark and Mr. Dimock we have agreed to submit the facts as they occurred on the field in order that the public may make up their opinion in the premises.

The meeting took place in the neighborhood of Washington, D. C., the weapons were pistols, the distance ten paces. The principals took their position, the pistols were loaded and presented to them by their respective seconds. Before we had taken our positions and before the word fire was given Mr. Dimock's pistol fired, whereupon Dr. Bryan immediately enquired the cause. Mr. HARRISS, Drs. Gibson and May concurred in the opinion that the firing was accidental. Dr. Bryan having moved off a few steps to get his pistol preparatory to taking his position did not see the pistol when it fired.

Mr. HARRISS then attempted to reload the pistol but failing to succeed he requested and obtained the assistance of Dr. Gibson. The pistols were again presented to the parties and the seconds took their positions and Dr. Bryan observing that Mr. Dimock's pistol was not held in the position agreed upon, requested him to conform to it, with this he complied, the word "fire" was then given by Dr. Bryan, both fired at nearly the same time without effect.

Mr. HARRISS then asked Mr. Clark if he was satisfied, Mr. Clark responded in the affirmative. The parties then left the field.

In attestation of which facts, we, Wm. T. Bryan and H. F. HARRISS, seconds of the respective parties, have hereunto subscribed our names.

How reckless! how stupid in infamy and baseness must HARRISS have been after receiving this note, to have stated deliberately in his letter to Dr. May, that he had called upon me to unite in a statement of what occurred on the field, and that I had failed to furnish him with any statement whatever. Now is this statement of what occurred on the field drawn up by me correct? Has it been impeached by a single witness? Does not the testimony of all the witnesses, so far as it goes, corroborate my statement?

First, as to the firing of Dimock's pistol, before the word "fire" was given. They all say that was so. It is true Drs. May and Gibson give it as their opinion, that the discharge was accidental. But how they can undertake to say, that it was certainly accidental surprises me. They could not look into his heart and say what motive was operating there. The truth is, HARRISS himself, thought and believed, that the firing proceeded from agitation; for if he did not think it proceeded from that

cause, but was "as pure an accident as ever happened", why did he, in handing the pistol a second time to Dimock, "caution him to be exceedingly careful or it might go off again"? If it was accidental, one would suppose that the certain and well founded suspicions, to which his conduct would expose him, would teach him caution enough to guard against a second firing out of time. If however, it proceeded from agitation, it can then be easily seen, how some small caution by the way of a whisper might be very serviceable, particularly when accompanied with an intimation that upon a second firing before the word, the forfeiture of his life would most certainly be insisted on, by the second of the adverse party.

Again, if Dimock was so self-possessed, so free from agitation, how comes it that when the pistol was put in his hand a second time, he failed to hold it in the position required by the rules, so much so as to render it necessary for me to call upon him to hold it right? Dr. May in his letter to me confirms my statement in this particular, by writing that "I (Dr. Bryan) did call on Dimock and require him to hold his pistol in conformity to the rules, and that his pistol was not held as it ought to be." Here then were two violations of the rules, which were adopted for the government of the fight, and which were signed by his second as well as by myself, violations following rapidly one after the other. As to Mr. Clark and myself, we both expressly stated on the field, that we were not looking at Dimock when his pistol fired. It is true that, most willing and swift witness Dr. Charles Bell Gibson not only stated that the discharge was accidental, but he accounts, most confidently for it, by saying it was caused by want of familiarity with the weapon.

What did this voracious Dr. C. B. Gibson know about the extent of Dimock's familiarity with the use of the pistol? He perhaps, never saw Dimock in his life before he became connected with this transaction. The truth is this, Dr. Gibson figures very largely in HARRISS's card. Being well paid as surgeon and there being no occasion for his services in that way, he still seems to labor under the impression, that he must do something for the money he received. So he seems disposed to make up in letters and testimony what was wanting in setting bones and spreading plasters. He not only writes one letter which seemed to satisfy his friend HARRISS, but fearing probably that was not strong enough, he sends a second one, which so far as appears to the public was entirely unsolicited. And what sort of letters are they? He was asked by me, to state the facts as they occurred from which the public might draw their own inferences and conclusions.

My letter he does not condescend to answer. In his reply to HARRISS instead of stating facts he contents himself with most general and indiscriminate praise both of HARRISS and his friend. In Gibson's last letter he states what is positively false. He states, that a reconciliation was proposed to Dimock by himself, in which proposition I, who was standing near, eagerly joined. After Mr. Clark had expressed himself satisfied, this fellow HARRISS marched up to him with all the staidness of a blue heron—took him by the hand—congratulated him, that the matter had terminated without bloodshed and proposed that he and Dimock shake hands. To this Mr. Clark replied "it is not worth while". A proposition was then made to Dimock out of hearing of Mr. Clark by Dr. Gibson, I think, for a reconciliation. I simply observed I thought it ought to be reconciled, when Dimock replied he had no animosity against Mr. Clark. But to return to the firing before the word was given, suppose it was the merest accident in the world? Does that make it less a forfeiture of Dimock's life? Read the following Rule under which the parties fought.

No. 5.

Art. 6th. Either principal firing before the word "Fire" or after the word "Stop" shall be liable to be shot down by the second of his adversary, who shall hold a loaded pistol in his hand for the purpose.

Is there any exception made in this Rule about accidents? If it was not intended that the accidental firing should work a forfeiture of one's life, the Rule ought to have been framed in a different

manner. It ought to have read thus. "If either principal shall fire before the word "Fire" is given, it shall be the duty of the second of the adverse party to shoot him down, unless it appear to the surgeons that the firing was accidental". But the Rule as adopted, and signed both by HARRISS and myself was as first stated, without any reservation in favor of accidents. It is made thus rigid in all cases of duelling, because of the impossibility of deciding whether it be accidental or intentional. In firing before the time a party may not purpose to kill and yet be highly criminal. His object may be to disconcert his adversary, which may prove a great advantage to the challenged party. I know it has always been understood that in the duel between Randolph and Clay, Randolph fired before the word. That was most certainly a forfeiture of his life. The forfeiture however was not insisted on by Mr. Clay, and the forfeiture perhaps never would be insisted on in any case, where there is room for charity to believe that it might possibly have been accidental. But the failure to insist upon it does not make it less a forfeiture.

In the second place my statement of the affair alleges that HARRISS then attempted to reload the pistol but failing to succeed, he requested and obtained the assistance of Dr. Gibson. What does Dr. May say upon this point? He says in his letter to me, dated July 28th, 1845, "I did not attend to the minutiae of the reloading of Mr. Dimock's pistol". Dr. May's attention it seems was not directed to the persons engaged in reloading. What is Dr. Gibson's testimony upon this point? In his letter to HARRISS so far as that letter has been published, he says nothing about it. I say so far as his letter has been published, for upon a careful examination of his first letter as published in HARRISS's card you will perceive it has the appearance of an extract. It commences without any "Sir or Dr." "Sir or Mr. HARRISS".

On the 23d of July I directed to Dr. Gibson and placed it in the post office at this place a letter in which among other things, I requested from him an answer to the following questions. "Did not Mr. HARRISS upon attempting to reload Mr. Dimock's pistol, fail to succeed until you (Dr. Gibson) aided him, and did not his agitation cause him to lose one or more charges of powder?" This question Dr. Gibson never has answered. My statement has been given—Dr. Gibson has been called on by me to confirm or deny it. He knows whether it is true or not because it concerns his own conduct, yet he does not contradict it. He is silent, at least to me. With the partialities for his side, which he has manifested in this transaction, would he not have denied it, if it had been without any foundation in truth? No one who is unprejudiced can say he would not. The fact is when HARRISS first arrived in Washington before he was properly drilled he acknowledged the difficulty he had in reloading, admitted the assistance he received from Dr. Gibson, and was very earnest and particular in explaining the cause.

After he had been here awhile he fell into shrewder hands, who upbraided him for having never learned, or if ever learned for forgetting, the first lesson taught a lawyer, to wit, to admit nothing, to deny every thing, and insist upon proof. They put him on a different track, and all at once he is ready to make sad havoc with any man who dare assert that he could not load a pistol. Load a pistol, to be sure he can, when he is not frightened, and he can even then with the assistance of Dr. Charles Bell Gibson.

Again, if HARRISS was so calm and self-possessed, why did his voice become suddenly so thick and tremulous when he seconded my call upon Dimock to hold up the muzzle of his pistol?

It was painful to witness the agitation and stuttering of the fellow. Some little parade is made in HARRISS's card about the affair having stopped after the first fire, without any explanation—any apology—any reconciliation.

Mr. Clark was not disposed to pursue the matter any further, for reasons not worth while here to disclose. HARRISS has no where alleged that Mr. Clark was wanting in coolness and self possession. Indeed in a statement, which I have in HARRISS's own hand writing, he admits that Mr. Clark behaved with "modesty, dignity and self-