Intelligencer & Journal.

Lancaster, August 3, 1852.

GEO. SANDERSON, EDITOR.

FOR PRESIDENT:

GEN. FRANKLIN PIERCE,

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

COL. WILLIAM R. KING,

OF ALABAMA.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,

WILLIAM SEARIGHT,

OF FAYETTE COUNTY.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

SENATORIAL.

GEORGE W. WOODWARD, of Luzerne.
WILSON M'CANDLESS, of Allegheny.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT.

ROBERT PATTERSON, of Philadelphia.

DISTRICTS.			
1.	Peter Logan,	13.	H. C. Eyer,
2.	Geo. H. Martin,	14.	John Clayton,
3.	John Miller,	15.	Isaac Robinson,
4.	F. W. Bockius,	16.	Henry Fetter,
5.	R. McCay, Jr.,	17.	James Burnside,
6.	A. Apple,	18.	Maxwell McCaslin,
7.	N. Strickland,	19.	Joseph McDonald,
8.	Abraham Peters,	20.	W. S. Colahan,
9.	David Fister,	21.	Andrew Burk,
10.	R. E. James,	22.	William Dunn,
11.	John McReynolds,	23.	J. S. M'Calmont,
12.	P. Damon,	24.	George R. Barret.

County Committee Meeting.

The Democratic County Committee of Lancaster County will meet at the public house of J. G. Leber, in E. King Street, in this City, on *Wednesday, the 18th of August*, 1852, at 1 o'clock, P. M. Punctual attendance is requested, as business of importance will be laid before the body.

WILLIAM MATHIOT,
Lancaster, Aug. 3, 1852. Chairman.

[The names of the gentlemen composing the County Committee will be published next week.]

Pierce and King Club.

A large and enthusiastic meeting of the Association was held at Scheirenbrand's Hotel, in West King Street, on Saturday evening last—the President, Capt. HENRY HAMBRIGHT, in the Chair.—Addresses were delivered by Messrs. SANDERSON, WILLIAM S. AMWEG and HILLS, and a handsome accession of new names was made to the roll of members.

The Club adjourned to meet at BLICKENSDERFER'S Hotel, in North Queen Street, on Saturday evening, the 14th inst., at 8 o'clock.

☞ An interesting correspondence between a number of citizens of New York and the Hon. JAMES X. MCLANAHAN, of Congress, in reference to the Irish patriot, T. F. MEAGHER, will be found on our first page.

Daily Pennsylvanian.

Arrangements have been made by which the Pennsylvanian (a penny paper) will be served regularly and promptly to subscribers in this city by the Carrier of the Intelligencer, immediately after the arrival of the Cars each day. Persons wishing to become subscribers to that paper will please leave their names at this office during the present week, as it is necessary to know what number of copies can be disposed of.

CHOLERA!—A man named McLean, residing in the upper end of West Orange street, in this City, died with a disease supposed to be Cholera on Saturday. Another man, named GIMPER, residing next door, and who assisted during the illness of the other, took the disease on Saturday night and died on Sunday. Report says that one or two other cases have occurred in that immediate neighborhood.

Our citizens cannot be too careful in their diet, &c. Strict attentinn should also be paid to cleanliness in every respect.

Portrait of Gen. Pierce.

W. L. ORMSBY & Co., of New York, have just published a handsome steel engraving of our distinguished nominee for the Presidency, representing the General, mounted on his war steed, with spyglass in hand, and in full uniform. It is admirably executed, and is said by those who have seen him to be a correct likeness. The picture is handsomely framed and retails as follows: with the gilded frame $4—without the frame, $2. Mr. THOMAS M. WHITELY, of Philadelphia, has been appointed agent for the sale of the engraving, and is now in this city attending to that business. Those of our Democratic fellow-citizens who may wish to obtain the picture, which, in addition to being a correct likeness of the next President of the United States, will be an ornament to their parlors, would do well to call upon the agent without delay, as his stay will be limited in this city. We have one of the Portraits hanging up in our office, where our friends can have a sight of Gen. PIERCE "free gratis for nothing."

Canal Commissioners' Statement.

The Harrisburg *Keystone* of Wednesday last publishes a statement from the Canal Commissioners in reference to leasing the right of carrying passengers over the Columbia and Philadelphia railroad. It appears to be a fair and full statement of the whole subject, and we think is an unanswerable argument in justification of the course pursued by the Canal Commissioners, and fully establishes the fact that in what they have done, they have been actuated solely by a desire to advance the interests of the Commonwealth. Notwithstanding its great length—nearly five of the broad columns of the *Keystone*—we shall endeavor to find room for it in our next issue.

Whig Slanders.

Many of our readers will recollect the foul and infamous slanders—the Peg Beatty and John Stonebreaker affidavits—concocted and propagated by the Whigs against David R. Porter, the Democratic candidate for Governor in 1838. The same course is now being pursued against WILLIAM SEARIGHT, the Democratic candidate for Canal Commissioner, for the double purpose of defeating him and carrying the State for Gen. Scott. They failed then in defeating Gov. Porter, and we predict that they will just as signally fail now in defeating Gen. Pierce and Mr. Searight.

We have occupied a considerable portion of our paper this week, with a refutation of these base calumnies against that good and true man, William Searight. For the first two articles, with the accompanying remarks, we are indebted to the Pennsylvanian. The others have their appropriate credits. All are from amongst the most respectable citizens of Mr. Searight's own neighborhood, and constitute a most triumphant vindication of his character from the reckless assaults of his unscrupulous opponents, and brand with infamy the author and propagators of the malignant and hellish slanders. We advise all our readers to give these statements an attentive perusal.

ACCIDENT.—Mr. Amos E. Reigart, son of E. C. Reigart, of this City, was seriously injured on yesterday morning, at the Steam Saw Mill, on the Conestoga, by being struck with a piece of timber on the head. He was in a critical condition at the time our paper went to press.

Lundy's Lane.

This famous battle was fought on the 25th of July, 1814, and now, after a lapse of eight and thirty years, its anniversary is celebrated for the first time by the Whig party. It was unquestionably one of the bloodiest battles of that war, and the immense loss of life on our side is to be mainly attributed to the rashness of Gen. SCOTT who commanded a brigade composed of the very flower of the American army. That Gen. SCOTT is a gallant soldier and brave man no one will dispute. His courage has been repeatedly tested on the battle fields of his country. But that he acted the part of a wise General or a skilful commander at Lundy's Lane, is what no one will allege with any degree of truthfulness. But even if he had given evidence of true Generalship, what was his rank at the time? He was only a subordinate officer, and (according to Whig doctrine as applied to his Mexican campaign,) could not monopolize all the credit of the victory. There were other officers present in addition to the commanding General BROWN. There were RIPLEY, and PORTER, and MILLER, and GAINES, and JESSUP—all of whom acted a gallant and distinguished part in the action, and who certainly behaved with much more prudence than Gen. SCOTT, who held his brigade in front of the British army and permitted it to be cut to pieces before the main body of the American army could be brought on the field. If credit is due to any one officer more than another, for the successful issue of the battle, it is to Col. MILLER who at the head of his gallant regiment captured the British battery that had dealt death and destruction to Gen. SCOTT's brigade, and without whose capture the battle would have been irretrievably lost.

The following article from the Buffalo *Courier* is so much to the point in reference to the battle that we cheerfully forego any further remarks of our own in order to give place to it. The editor—and he speaks what he knows, and what every sensible man knows who has any correct knowledge of the history of that battle—says:—

"The Whigs are making a spasmodic effort to create a little enthusiasm in their flagging ranks by celebrating the Anniversary of the battle, of Lundy's Lane, and turn over what of glory or credit that that battle reflected on the American arms to Gen. Scott, to aid him in reaching the Presidential chair.

We are the last to deny the merits, or to attempt to abate from the reputation of any one who has served his country long and well in any capacity; but are equally averse to one assuming honors that belong to others. Courage and patriotism are natural attributes of the American people, and to find one possessing an opposite spirit would be an exception to the general rule. Gen. Scott, in common with all his countrymen, is a patriotic citizen. He has shown himself to be a man of courage—of personal bravery, in a high degree—a claim which we as a nation, set up before the world, for all who have had an opportunity to distinguish themselves upon the battle field, with scarcely an exception.

War has been the business of Gen. Scott's life.—For this he was educated, and the camp has been his home since early manhood. That he should be distinguished in his profession is natural—it is a necessity which he could not well have avoided, and not utterly disgraced his citizenship.

But no man is perfect—there is no man but what at some period of his career makes great mistakes even in his chosen profession. A general military career may be glorious, while isolated points in it may not be even creditable. We therefore think that the celebration of the Anniversary of the battle of Lundy's Lane, has been illy chosen by the Whigs for the accomplishment of the purposes for which it is designed. There are two or three reasons why we hold this opinion.

In the first place, Gen. Scott was but a subordinate, acting under the orders of a superior officer. It it is claimed that Gen. Scott shall bear off the credit of this battle, then what becomes of the glory of the Mexican campaign? He did not fight the battles there—subordinate officers did the work, and the same rule should apply in both cases. If General Brown is to be despoiled of his laurels—if Miller, Ripley, Gaines, Porter and their associates are to be ignored, then we shall insist upon applying the same proces to the Mexican campaign, and of dividing its honors, at least, with those who won them hand in hand with the enemy.

But there is another reason why the selection of this battle is unfortunate. That Gen. Scott was brave to rashness in his younger days, is well known to all who are acquainted with his career on the Niagara frontier. He was ordered by Gen. Brown to proceed from the camp at Chippewa, to observe the enemy, and to hold him in check until the main army came up. He advanced up the road and deployed his Brigade which consisted of two Regiments, the 11th and 22d, we believe—in front of the woods within point blank musket shot of the British army under Gen. Riall. This precipitated the action, and his brigade was completely riddled—almost annihilated before assistance could arrive. There was scarcely enough men left of the two to form a skeleton Regiment in the rear of the reserve which interposed between them and the British fire. Of his own Regiment but few were left fit for duty. It required a fearful sacrifice of life to retrieve this error of Gen. Scott and to the heroic Miller who led his invincible command up the declivity amid a storm of "leaden rain and iron hail" and captured the British cannon, more than to any other, belongs the glory of that battle. His immortal "I'll try, sir," was the turning point of that bloody battle field. Nearly nine hundred men lay bleeding and dead upon that plain—a large portion of them slain because of the premature and unauthorized bringing on of the battle by Gen. Scott.

In all this, we do not in the least impeach his bravery or his patriotism. But when bravery degenerates into rashness, it ceases to command our respect. It required super-human efforts and a bloody sacrifice, to prevent an utter defeat. In the battle all behaved as American officers are expected by their countrymen to behave. But the credit of its successful issue does not belong to Gen. Scott—Miller's charge upon the battery decided the fate of the day. Had that miscarried, all would have been lost. Of this Gen. Brown was aware when he gave him the desperate work to do. He said that the enemy's cannon, which occupied a commanding point, and which swept the field, must be captured, or he could not maintain his position."

☞ Amongst the passengers lost by the burning of the Steamer Henry Clay, in the Hudson river—an account of which will be found in another column—was the wife and two children of our esteemed fellow-citizen, JOHN L. THOMPSON, Esq., District Attorney for this County. Himself, together with another child and nurse, escaped. The bodies of the two children were obtained and recognized on Thursday morning, the day after the calamity occurred, but that of Mrs. T. was only found on Saturday, after having floated some four miles down the river. Mrs. Thompson was an estimable lady, and her sad fate is deeply mourned, not only by a fond and indulgent husband, but by a large circle of friends and acquaintances. Mr. Thompson, we understand, is in a state bordering on distraction, the awful calamity with which he has been visited having completely unmanned him. A Committee from the Masonic Lodge of this City, of which he is a worthy member, proceeded to New York, on Thursday, for the purpose of rendering him every assistance and consolation in their power. From Mayor Keifer, who returned on Sunday, we learn that the bodies of Mrs. T. and her two children would be intered at Princeton, N. J., (her native place,) on yesterday.

☞ At the latest accounts 73 dead bodies had been recovered from the wreck of the Henry Clay. It is supposed the number lost is very little, if any, short of 100!

A WHOLE MANUFACTORY COME OVER.—The Trenton True American states "that the hands of a large manufacturing establishment in Newark, who formerly voted the Whig Ticket will this Fall vote for the Democratic nominees. The Southern trade of Newark has been severely injured by the Woolly-heads, and Seward and Greely's candidate will feel its effect, despite his epauletts.

DAVID WILMOT.—We observe by the last Potter Union that Hon. David Wilmot addressed the young men's Democratic Club of Coudersport, on which occasion he expressed himself well satisfied with the nominations of Pierce and King, and declared his determination to give them his hearty and cordial support.

ADJUTANT GENERAL.—The President has appointed Brevet Lieutenant Colonel SAMUEL COOPER to be Adjutant General of the Army, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Gen. Jones.

Major General Patterson.

It gives us pleasure to publish the following tribute of respect to Maj. Gen. ROBERT PATTERSON When the war broke out with Mexico he was surrounded by all the enjoyments which affluence, family and friends could secure. He was also embarked in the most extensive business engagements. But he voluntarily left all behind to encounter the dangers of war in the enemy's country and the perils of exposure in an unhealthy climate. His conduct at Vera Cruz and Cerro Gorda elicited the highest praise, and his kind and gentlemanly deportment towards the brave men under his command received their gratitude and regard. The people of this city well remember the temrs of commendation in which these war-worn citizen-soldiers spoke of their commanding General during their temporary sojourn in this place, on their return from their victorious achievements in Mexico:

From the Pittsburg Post.

The following correspondence between a number of our fellow-citizens and Gen. Robert Patterson, of Philadelphia, has been left with us for publication. It is a matter of regret that Gen. P. should decline partaking of the public dinner tendered him by his numerous personal and political friends in this city. There is no man within the bounds of this Commonwealth who is more deserving of the respect and honor of its citizens than General Patterson, for he has at all times been a devoted friend of Pennsylvania, and has struggled untiringly to advance the interests and prosperity of her people.

PITTSBURG, June 15, 1852.

Major General Robert Patterson.

SIR:—The undersigned, your fellow citizens, who have long regarded you with high favor as a citizen, but whose esteem and regard have been greatly enhanced by your noble and gallant conduct in the war with Mexico, are anxious to offer you a testimonial of their respect and admiration. We therefore respectfully ask your acceptance of a public dinner, on such day as may suit your convenience, during your visit to our city.

We are, sir very truly and sincerely,

C. Shaler, J. B Guthrie, Wm. Wilkins, Wilson McCandless, Samuel W. Black, R. B. Carnahan, Patrick M Kenna, Jas. F. Campbell, L. Harper, Andrew Burke, Thos. J. Keenan, Geo. A. Keyser, Alfred B. McCalmot, H. Sproul, Geo. P. Hamilton, J. M. Davis, W. W. Irwin, Thos Blackmore, George McCook, Z. Scott, Alex. Black, John Layton, P. C. Shannon, Lynde Elliot, Thos. Phillips, Robert Ankerson, M. Kane, jr., John S. Hamilton, R. Morrow, Charles Naylor, H. S. Magraw, James B. Sawyer, M. I. Stewart, Rody Patterson, Charles Barnett, Thos. Umbstactter, Charles Kent, Joseph Birmingham, Wm. Trovillo, David Beeler, James P. Barr, John C. Dunn, John D. Milter, W. S. Campbell.

PITTSBURG, June 15, 1852.

GENTLEMEN:—Your esteemed favor of this date tendering me the honor of a public dinner, is received.

I am under renewed obligations to my fellow-citizens of Pittsburg for this additional "testimonial of their esteem and regard," and receive it, as I am sure it was intended—not for me personally, or a compliment to my poor services, but as the representative of the gallant officers and soldiers of the division it was my good fortune to command.

For myself, and on behalf of my brother soldiers, I return you my most cordial and grateful thanks, and regret that long absence from my family, and the necessity for my departure in the morning, will deprive me of the pleasure of accepting your kind invitation.

I remain gentlemen, with the highest regard very sincerely, your friend and obliged fellow-citizen.

R. PATTERSON.

To Hon. C. Shaler, J. B. Guthrie, and others.

We are pleased to see the above tribute paid to one of our Pennsylvania generals who served in the recent Mexican war, coming from the Western portion of the Commonwealth, and especially so, as Philadelphia, under the influence of a little Whig leaven, and a little Home prejudice, has endeavored to ignore rather than to do justice to his admirable conduct in Mexico. The Generalissimo of a victory, is not the only officer entitled to credit—He represents only officers and men—and is often like the Pound Sterling, no real coin, but made up of an aggregate of other values. Maj. Gen. Patterson stands high in the estimation of the volunteers whom he commanded, whose comfort and life might easily have been sacrificed, upon some bold stroke, which even if unsuccessful would have turned over to his name the courage of the slain.

At Vera Cruz and Cerro Gordo, his conduct deserves the highest praise, and as an officer of high rank and capacity, Pennsylvania may well single him out, as brave in judgment as well as brave in the field. Without a personal acquaintance with the General, we have often heard him eulogized, by the volunteers, the men of all others best able to appreciate the leader most true to them and his country.—*Carbon Democrat.*

Judges Black and Lewis.

These two distinguished Judges of our Supreme Court were invited, by the Democrats of Philadelphia, to participate in the Anniversary Celebration of the 4th of July. Of course they declined the invitation; but at the same time wrote eloquent and patriotic letters in favor of the Democratic cause, extracts from which we gave in the Intelligencer two weeks ago. This was a mortal sin in the eyes of Federalism, and, for daring to advocate the rights of the people, they have been taken soundly to task by some of the Whig prints. Amongst others, our neighbor of the Independent Whig essays to be very severe upon them—calls the writing of those letters "Judicial Indecency"—and devotes nearly a column to the abuse of these gentlemen. He calls them "demagogues," and stigmatizes their conduct as an attempt to "corrupt the fountains of justice," and further says that in this they have "shown in all their turpitude the baseness of their hearts." He alleges that their minds are "bloated with prejudice and themselves drunk with bigotry," and winds up his tirade of abuse by saying that "they are a disgrace to the Judiciary of the Commonwealth which gave them birth," &c., &c.

Now all this is very severe on the part of our neighbor, and shows a wonderful proclivity in the *youth* for dealing in ugly words culled from the vocabulary of billingsgate; but still we are strongly inclined to the belief that our two friends will survive this terrible onslaught, and that they will move on in the even tenor of their way, regardless of denunciation from that or any other quarter. The Democracy of the Commonwealth know Judges BLACK and LEWIS to be high-minded, honorable and trust-worthy men, whose character as able and upright Jurists is beyond the reach of calumny or reproach, and the people will abundantly sustain them despite all the infuriated ravings of disappointed Federalism.

The Portage Road.

The following are the allotments of the work on Portage Road, made July 29th, 1852, by the Canal Commissioners:

SECTIONS.	NAMES.
10	Charles Carson,
12	Andrews, Barr & Barr,
14	" " "
20	Burkholder & Co.,
22	and Tunnel, Morehead and Patterson,
23	McQuaid & Co.,
24	G. W. English,
25	Bailey & Co.,
26	Alexander McCammon & Co.,
27	" " "
28	Barbar & Laughlin,
29	D. H. & D. Daugherty,
30	Hunter, Kirkpatrick, Anderson & Co.,
31	Hoover, Keach & Tamany,
32	Rockefellow & Hamilton,
33	Arnold & Barber,
34	Cummings & Painter,
35	Alexander & Hastings,
36	E. D. Gillis,
37	Beck & Dull,
38	Arnold & Rhey,
39	Leisenring & Shriner,
40	George, Scott & Co.,
41	Daugherty & Murray.

TIMOTHY IVES, Sup't.

Lock at Northumberland to Riddell, Sallada & Co.

Lock at New Hope to James Burns.

Lock at Ehulersville to Thomas Meelun.

Acqueduct and Bridges, Newhope, to Bitting & Gregor.

Widening Canal at Newhope to E. Picket.

☞ The Coal House, belonging to the Colebrook Iron Works, in Lebanon county, was burnt on Wednesday last. Loss estimated at $8,000.

William Searight.

Testimony of an Honest Man and a Neighbor in his favor.

Mr. Searight, the Democratic candidate for Canal Commissioner, having been for several days confined to his bed by severe illness, the jackals of the opposition have thought proper to embrace it as a favorable time to attack his character for honesty and capacity in the most villainous manner. The persons who make these attacks are utterly irresponsible: they have neither character nor property to lose; hence their boldness in making and republishing such base, contemptible charges against an honest man, while laying on a sick bed. It is with pleasure we publish the following unsolicited testimony in favor of Mr. Searight, from a neighbor of his—a gentleman who is well known for his love of justice and detestation of every thing that is base and dishonorable. We ask our readers to ponder over it and see how effectually it nails to the counter the puny efforts of personal and political enemies:

UNIONTOWN, July 20, 1852.

To W. H. HOPE, Esq., Editor of the *Pennsylvanian*:

SIR—Attention to my business called me to Fayette county, where I had formerly mainly resided for about twelve years, and where I have many valued friends. On my arrival in Uniontown, I was shown a statement published in the *Pennsylvania Democrat*, a Whig paper, written—or purporting to have been written—by Hugh Graham, charging Mr. SEARIGHT, the Democratic candidate for Canal Commissioner, with gross crimes, dishonest and dishonorable conduct. I have been long and intimately acquainted with both these gentlemen, and although Mr. Searight and myself were in conflict some years since as applicants for the same office, and have personally not been intimate since that period, yet I feel bound, in justice to Mr. Searight as well as to the Democratic party and in truth, to bear my public testimony to his high character for integrity—for honor and truthfulness as a gentleman. No man could stand higher in the estimation of the community in which he resides than does Mr. Searight, in all points which constitute the valuable character of a high-minded, honorable man.

As to Mr. Graham, with whom I am also well acquainted, I have but two things to say—the one the assertion of a fact, the other an inference which I may fairly draw without rendering myself liable to the charge of unfriendly feelings towards him, which I utterly disclaim. Although Mr. Graham states that he is a Democrat, or a "Democratic voter," yet he certainly was not so regarded during my residence in Fayette county—*he never had the confidence of the Democratic party.*

As to the inference which the reading of his statement constrained me to draw it was by no means favorable to his motives. He has withheld this statement until the eve of an important election, when Mr. Searight is the candidate of his party for an office of high trust and dignity. To have preserved his motives free from just imputation, he should have published it earlier or withheld it until after the second Tuesday of October. He also admits that the only aggravation he had was his defeat in a law-suit, in which Mr. Searight was not personally the party, but acting merely as a public agent. The public will, therefore, be quite likely, instead of attaching censure to Mr. Searight, award him praise and credit for faithfully guarding the public interests at the hazard of making a personal enemy. Besides, the gentlemen who passed upon the merits of this claim are gentlemen of the highest character for intelligence and integrity, as I well know.

I make this statement not as a politician or partizan but in justice to Mr. Searight, a high-minded, honorable man, with whom I was, some years since, in honorable contest for the office of Commissioner of the Cumberland Road, and in justice to the Democratic party, whose candidate he is, and with no ill will towards Mr. Graham, who has, in this instance, suffered his feelings to get the better of his judgment, leading him to an act of injustice towards a neighbor—an act which subsequent reflection will cause him to regret.

Very respectfully your friend and obedient servant,

W. M. F. MAGRAW

An Honest Man Vindicated.

A number of small irresponsible sheets of the opposition, controlled by reckless bad men, have commenced a violent attack on WM SEARIGHT, the Democratic candidate for Canal Commissioner.—When this base work commenced, we denounced it as a fabrication of the enemy unworthy the belief of any respectable man. We had, and still have in our possession, the best evidences that the letter said to have been written to HUGH KEYS, is a forgery; and in the trial for slander, which will soon come off, against the wretches who are endeavoring to defeat Mr. SEARIGHT'S election by circulating villainous libels, it will be shown to be such; and we trust that the creatures who have endeavored to rob an honest man of his character, will receive their reward.

We invite the attention of our readers to the following card from the Pittsburg *Post*, of Friday last, which shows the value of the despicable slanders of Mr. SEARIGHT by his enemies:

SLANDER REFUTED.

UNIONTOWN, July 17, 1852.

Messrs. Editors:—A statement has been made in the Federal organ of this county, for the purpose of injuring the election of the Democratic nominee for Canal Commissioner. A formal contradiction of all the ridiculous allegations made in this statement, has been deemed unnecessary by the friends of Mr. Searight in this county. But lest some unfavorable impression should be produced abroad by Graham's malignant charges, we have drawn up the following facts, which we desire you to publish in your paper, it having a more general circulation than our local organ. Mr. Searight was the Superintendent of the Cumberland Road for several years, and during that time Graham produced a claim against the road for some $2.000, which was rejected by Mr. Searight, because he believed it to be entirely unjust. Suit was brought by Graham, and at his own solicitation the whole matter was referred to the Trustees of the Road, who, upon a careful examination of the accounts, awarded him Fifty-two dollars and 75 cents. Graham was much enraged at being thus baffled in his attempt to get his hands into the public Treasury, and his professed friendship for Mr. Searight, was turned into the bitterest enmity. Immediately after his nomination for Canal Commissioner, he threatened him with publications, but at the same time preferred to be quiet, upon the payment of $100. Upon the indignant refusal of Mr. Searight to give him this "*hush money*," he threw himself into the embraces of a few of the Whig leaders of this county. We say *few*, because many of the most prominent Whigs here support Mr. Searight out of regard for his private worth.

The time has been when Mr. Graham would have scorned the authorship of his recent reckless production, but intemperance has well fitted him to become the pliant tool of Whig politicians. He charges Mr. Searight with having forged an order, which he (Searight) presented at the trial before the Trustees. His proof of this is, that but one order was ever given, and that he (Graham) has it now in his possession. Since the publication of this charge, Mr. Graham has been shown another order, WHICH HE ACKNOWLEDGES TO BE GENUINE; THEREBY CONFESSING THE ENTIRE FALSITY OF HIS CHARGE. This would be sufficient to show the reliance to be placed in Graham's statement, and convince every one of its folly. There are none so credulous as to believe that a public officer would commit a forgery that did not inure to his own benefit, but to that of the public. There are few public servants thus faithful.

Graham has also published a letter, purporting to have been written by Mr. Searight to Hugh Keys, dec'd., and dated in 1840, which is a most ridiculous caricature, gotten up for the purpose of creating an impression, that Mr. Searight is incompetent as well as dishonest. It is only necessary to say, that no such letter was ever written by Mr. Searight, as will be shown upon the trial of the suit for slander which has been instituted. We are convinced that Graham's statement has been gotten up for the occasion from the tone of the letter, purporting to be from Keys to Graham. We have examined the correspondence between Mr. Searight and Mr. Keys, subsequent to the date of this letter, and find that up to the time of the decease of the latter, he expressed the warmest feelings of friendship for Mr. Searight, and are informed by the neighbors of Mr. Keys, that Mr. Searight was his constant attendant during his last sickness. If this letter be genuine, Mr. Keys acknowledges and publishes his own dishonesty, which no one acquainted with him would for a moment believe.

We submit this statement, after a careful investigation of the facts connected with the whole matter.

Respectfully,

A. S. Fuller,	Jabez Thorndell,
W. C. M'Kean,	Wm. Thorndell, Sr.
Philip Gans,	G. W. K. Minor,
Chas. P. Austin,	Jacob Stahl,
W. W. Williams,	Andrew Patrick,
Wm. A. West,	Eli Sturgeon,
Simon Houser,	B. S. Hunt,

William Beatty.

☞ A National Union Convention met as Philadelphia on Saturday last, for the purpose of nominating DANIEL WEBSTER for the Presidency. Sixteen States were represented.

☞ Mr. Hugh Graham, a prominent democrat of Fayette county, has a long article in a late number of the Uniontown Democrat, in which he assails Mr. Searight, the locofoco candidate for Canal Commissioner, with great fierceness. He charges that gentleman with cheating him out of $100, by charging him that amount twice, as a contractor under him on the Cumberland road while he only paid it once. He also charges him with forgery, and with defrauding orphan children. As this is a family quarrel we are content to stand by and see the "Harmonious Democracy" fight it out among themselves.—*Reporter.*

We are sorry to notice the above paragraph in the Reporter, or any other paper making the least claim to respectability; for it is, beyond doubt, one of the meanest and vilest slanders ever propagated. And who is this "*Hugh Graham*," the "prominent Democrat?" And what, too, is the sum and substance of the offence which Mr. Searight has been guilty of against common honesty, common justice or even the immaculate Hugh Graham? What, we say, has that most worthy and estimable man done that the tongue of slander should be wagged to defame the name and reputation of as pure, magnanimous and noble-hearted a man as lives in all the land? We will give you, reader, the answer in a few words, and about this matter we chanced to have heard something years ago—therefore, we are in a measure posted on the subject.

Whilst Mr. Searight was Commissioner of the eastern end of the Cumberland road in Pennsylvania, Hugh Graham, presented a claim amounting to near *two thousand dollars* for work alleged to have been done on said road. As Commissioner, acting under oath, Mr. Searight asked that the justice of the claim should be made out in such a manner as would warrant the payment thereof. This Hugh Graham failed to do in the estimation of Mr. Searight. Subsequently suit was brought by Graham, and after adjudicating the matter for some time, the Court of Fayette county referred it to the three Trustees of the Cumberland road—Messrs. *Fuller, Hendrickson*, and we think, *Marshall*—all honest and competent men. After giving the subject their careful attention and investigating the subject on both sides, these gentlemen decided that Hugh Graham was justly entitled to something less than *two hundred dollars!* Now, in what light did that award place the two parties—Hugh Graham, on the one side, whose object was to plaster his pockets with the people's money, and Mr. Searight, on the other side, whose only purpose was to discharge his duty as the representative of the State? Certainly, the latter was most triumphantly sustained, and it is worse than vain for Hugh Graham, who is not known beyond the limits of his own immediate neighborhood, to assail the reputation or character of a man who has discharged his whole duty in every station to which the people have called him.—So much for the way in which Mr. Searight "*cheated*" Hugh Graham. Had he acted otherwise, in this view of the case, he would have cheated the public and perjured his own soul.

But, Mr. Searight is, also, charged with "forgery and defrauding orphan children." We know not what constitutes the foundation of these base charges, yet it is fair to presume that there is not a scintilla of truth to sustain them; and the fact that Mr. Searight has instituted *a suit of salnder* against Hugh Graham is proof that he courts investigation. If a good character is worth any thing at all, no man can believe aught else than that Mr. Searight has been most outrageously calumniated and that too, to gratify the malice of a vindictive individual. As well might such charges be preferred against any other man in the State as William Searight. He has lived too long and is too strongly fortified in the affections of his friends and acquaintances to be injured by the shafts of malice or detraction. He has done too many noble acts of charity and has established for himself too high a character for integrity, to suffer from the malignant assaults of either personal or unprincipled political enemies.—*Washington Examiner.*

☞ We copy the following communication from the last number of the Uniontown *Democrat*:—

MR. EDITOR:—Justice to myself and to Mr. Searight requires that I should briefly notice the communication of Mr. Graham in your last paper, in reference to the affairs of the late Mr. Keys and William Searight, Esq. Mr. Graham caused suit to be brought against Mr. Searight, by the administrators of the estate of Mr. Keys. I am one of the administrators alluded to, but had no agency whatever in instituting such a suit. Some time after the death of Mr. Keys, but before the settlement of our administration account, Mr. Graham alleged that a partnership existed between Keys and Searight in a contract held by the latter for building an Aqueduct over Elk Creek, on the Conneaut division of the Erie extension, Pennsylvania Canal. No evidence, whatever, was furnished me, showing a contract or arrangement or "understanding" between them, but although pained at a suggestion which if true, would bring dishonor on Mr. Keys, I was nevertheless no more unmindful of the interests of his family than Mr. Graham, and I consulted John Dawson, Esq., of Uniontown, the Attorney for the estate, who assured me that there was nothing to justify a suit, and that one could not be sustained. Mr. Graham was not satisfied with this and I proposed to consult James Veech, Esq., who fully concurred with Mr. Dawson in opinion.

Mr. Keys and Mr. Searight had been partners in some contracts on the National Road in this State and in Ohio, the books and accounts pertaining to which, were generally kept by Mr. Keyes, he drawing the estimates for their work, and making the disbursements of the same. A settlement of all these accounts was made by the administrators, Mr. William Keys, and myself, with Mr. Searight, together with the private accounts of Keys and Searight and a large balance was found to be due Searight, after crediting Keys with a check on the Erie Bank for $1500 and $500 of cash to Searight by Keys. These are the sums which I presume Mr. Graham alludes to and alleges were paid to Searight on the Elk Creek Aqueduct, but which he erroneously makes $4000. According to the books, these sums were due to Mr. Searight, without reference to that work? No evidence existed showing that they were advanced, as alleged by Mr. Graham, and I never heard such a suggestion until it was made to me by Mr. G. more than a year after the settlement.

Mr. Graham filed exceptions to our administration account, and Robert Rogers, Samuel Evans and Thomas R. Davidson, were appointed auditors.—These gentlemen after a laborious and patient investigation of the account and of the settlement, with all the books and papers and evidence before them which the Administrators had, and with the assistance and explanations of Mr. Graham and his counsel, unanimously sustained the settlement made by the administrators.

Mr. Graham has impliedly, but no doubt unintentionally, assailed the correctness of the settlement. If he is right in his allegations that a partnership existed between Mr. Searight and Mr. Keys, and that $4000, or any other sum was advanced on that work by Mr. Keys, then the settlement made by the administrators was wrong—the auditors were wrong in sustaining the settlement, and the Court was wrong in confirming the report of the auditors.

WM. F. COPLAN.

☞ The regular annual meeting of the Lancaster County Educational Association will be held at the Mechanics' Institute, in this City, on Saturday next, the 7th inst., at 10 o'clock, A. M. The members of the Association and the friends of education generally are invited to be present, as a number of reports and essays will be read, and subjects of interest be discussed at the meeting.

Book Notices.

THE PENNSLYLVANIA SCHOOL JOURNAL in its enlarged form has made its appearance, and is in every respect creditable to the Editor and Publisher. The July No. commences the new series, and contains 32 pages of highly interesting and instructive matter on the subject of Education. The editor, Mr. BURROWES, is admirably qualified, both by education and experience, to conduct such a Journal, and we have no doubt that, in his hands, the word will go forward prosperously.

The subscription price of the School Journal is only $1 per annum, payable in advance.

☞ THE TEMPLE, for August, is already published, and is withal a capital number. The work is devoted to Free Masonry, Literature and Science, printed in Carlisle, and edited by Messrs. PARKE & BLUMENTHAL. Each number contains 32 pages, with an illustration and colored cover, and the subscription price is $1,50 per annum, payable in advance.

Important Debate.

In our last week's paper we stated that Mr. MASON, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the U. S. Senate, had offered an important resolution on the subject of the existing difficulties respecting the Fisheries. Subjoined is the resolution with the animated and interesting debate which followed its introduction:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be required to communicate to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, all correspondence on file in the Executive department, with the Government of England or its Diplomatic Representatives, since the Convention between the United States and Great Britain, of October 20th, 1818, touching the fisheries on the Coasts of the British Possessions in North America, and the rights of citizens of the United States, engaged in such fisheries, as secured by the said Convention—and that the President be also requested to inform the Senate whether any of the naval forces of the United States have been ordered to the Seas adjacent to the British Possessions in North America, to protect the rights of American fishermen under said Convention of 1818, since the receipt of the intelligence that a large and unusual naval force has been ordered there to enforce certain alleged rights of Great Britain under said Convention.

Mr. MASON said: I have thought it my duty, considering the present aspect of affairs, so far as they are communicated to us by the public journals, to submit this resolution, and ask that it be considered immediately. We are informed unofficially, but in a manner clearly indicating that it is correct, that the British Government has recently asserted rights under the Convention of 1818 in relation to the fisheries in the north, which whether they exist or not, they suffered from 1818 to 1841, when the question was moved as to the respective rights of British subjects and American citizens under the Treaty of 1818,—they still suffered to remain in *statu quo*. Sir, the British Government know well, that very large interests are embarked by citizens of the United States, in these fisheries; they know that the harbors and coasts and seas off their possessions in North America swarm at stated seasons of the year—and this, as I am informed, is one of the seasons—with these fishing vessels; yet suddenly, without notice of any kind, we are informed from the public journals, and semi-officially by a sort of proclamation from the Secretary of State, that a very large British naval force has been ordered into those seas for the purpose of enforcing, at the mouth of the cannon, the construction which Great Britain has now recently determined to place on that Convention.

Now, Sir, I had supposed, in this civilized age, and between two such countries as those of Great Britain and the United States, that were it the purpose of England to revive her construction of this Convention, and require that it should be enforced, ordinary national courtesy would have required that notice should have been given of that determination on the part of Great Britain. But, Sir, when no such notice is given, when, on the contrary, the first information which reaches us is that Great Britain has ordered into those seas a large naval force for the purpose of enforcing this alleged right, I know not in what light it may strike other Senators, but it strikes me as a far higher offence than a breach of national courtesy—as one of insult and indignity to the whole American people. This morning, in the first paper I took up from the north, I see extracted from one of the British colonial newspapers, printed at St. John's, New Brunswick, a formal statement of the actual naval force ordered by Great Britain into those seas.

It consists of the *Cumberland*, a 70 gun ship, commanded by Sir G. H. Seymour, who I believe, is a British Admiral commanding on the West India Station; and then follows an enumeration of steam vessels, sloops of war, and schooners to the number of nineteen, ordered to rendezvous there immediately, and with the utmost despatch, for what purpose? To enforce at once, and without notice to this government—so far as I am informed, and yet we have some information through the quasi proclamation of the Secretary of State—at the mouth of the cannon, the construction which the British government places on that