



## Jeffersonian Republican.

Thursday, August 5, 1852.

For President,  
**GEN. WINFIELD SCOTT**  
OF NEW-JERSEY.  
For Vice-President,  
**WILLIAM A. GRAHAM**  
OF NORTH-CAROLINA.  
For Judge of Supreme Court,  
**JOSEPH BUFFINGTON**  
OF ARMSTRONG COUNTY.  
For Canal Commissioner,  
**JACOB HOFFMAN**  
OF BERKS COUNTY.

FOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

SENATORIAL.  
A. E. Brown, Samuel A. Purviance, James Pollock.  
REPRESENTATIVE.  
1. William F. Hughes, 13. Ned Middleswarth.  
2. James Truax, 14. James H. Campbell.  
3. John W. Stokes, 15. James D. Paxton.  
4. John P. Verree, 16. James K. Davidson.  
5. Spencer McElwaine, 17. Dr. John McCulloch.  
6. James W. Fuller, 18. Ralph Drake.  
7. James Fenwick, 19. John Linton.  
8. John Shaffer, 20. Archibald Robertson.  
9. Jacob Marshall, 21. Thomas J. Righam.  
10. Charles P. Waller, 22. Lewis L. Lord.  
11. Davis Alton, 23. Christian Meyers.  
12. M. C. Mercier, 24. Dorman Phelps.

### Graham vs. Searight.

We publish another communication today from Hugh Graham against his neighbor and Locofoco brother Searight, the candidate of the so-called Democracy for Canal Commissioner. It will be seen that Hugh insists upon his charges being true, and defies contradiction. Be that as it may, one thing is certain and that is, Searight has not dared to deny, under his own signature, the authenticity of the letter published by us as his. He has a good reason for not attempting such a task. He knows it to have been written by himself.

### Terrible Calamity.

The steamer Henry Clay, with about 300 passengers on board, took fire on the 28th ult., while running a race with steamer Armenia on the Hudson river, and was run on shore by the captain, near Yonkers. Here a frightful struggle to escape the burning vessel, took place, in which about 70 lives were lost.

Mr. John H. Melick, proprietor of the "Union Hotel," of this place, was in Albany on the morning this steamer left, had made arrangements to take passage on the boat, and was already on board, but just as she was about starting, jumped off in consequence of not meeting there a gentleman he expected to see. He thus fortunately escaped the danger to which so many persons were fatally exposed.

### Activity in the Navy.

It is stated that the frigate Constitution (Old Ironsides) now at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, has been ordered to be put in immediate readiness for sea, and for that purpose she has been taken into dock. The sloop-of-war Warren, brig Dolphin, and one or two other naval vessels lying at the yard, have been ordered to get ready for sea within a few days past.

### Massacre by the Indians.

The latest arrivals state that the greatest excitement prevails along our South-western frontier, in consequence of recent outrages committed by the Indians. Captain Marcy, son of Ex-Governor Marcy, of New York, with 80 men, was recently murdered, by about 1,000 Indians, Camanches and Kioways, on their way to attack the Military posts, on the headwaters of the Red River. The Indians entered his camp and were kindly received, and left laden with a number of presents. At night they ran off with the horses and mules of the troops, and the next morning made their attack on the camp. The fight lasted all day.

**MUTILATED BANK NOTES.**—A suit was recently tried before one of the lower courts in the city of Pittsburgh to recover of the Exchange Bank the value of a five dollar mutilated note. The note had about an inch torn off the middle of it, which, it was contended by the officers of the bank could, with a like amount from five other bills, form a sixth, and one equally as good and passable as that presented at the bank for redemption. The bank had offered to give four dollars for the note, but it was refused, and the full value demanded. The bank was sustained by the court, which decided that the holder of the note was not entitled to the full value represented on its face.

Four millions of manufactured goods are now annually exported from France to the United States.

Edwin Forrest will presently "lead to the altar," one of the finest women in Philadelphia, says "on dit."

**Delaware Canal.**—The navigation on this canal has been interrupted for a few days by a breach near Bristol.

### Who killed Cock Robin?

That is no longer the question. For a while the question was, did Searight pen the Keys' letter? That having been established, the inquiry now is, who was the political death of Wm. Searight? It was Hugh Graham, his Locofoco neighbor. Bowman, in the last Bedford Gazette, says:

The Democratic papers in Uniontown have attempted to explain the "Hugh Graham, Disclosures," and, in so doing, they seem to admit the authenticity of the letter said to have been written by Mr. Searight to Mr. Keys.

Now, the *revolving part of the whole business* is Mr. Searight's own letter, and, if this is admitted, all the locomotive power in the State could not drag the Democracy into his support, and it would be degrading to the principles we profess, to ask them to vote for such a candidate, with such a production fastened upon him!

This has become a grave question—one which rises above all considerations about ANY MAN—and if it is not met fearlessly and honestly, without dodging or equivocation, it will involve the Democratic party in a degree of odium, the effect of which cannot be calculated.

The re-assembling of the State Convention will afford a glorious opportunity to adjust this affair, and proclaim the virtue of Democracy, and, if it is not done, let the responsibility rest with those who assume it. We wash our hands of all participation in attempting to bolster up a candidate who could be guilty of penning a letter so disgraceful and infamous as that "addressed to Mr. Keys in 1840."

A girl only 7 years of age, 3 feet 9 inches high, weighs 127 lbs., and with whiskers and moustache "fully equal to those of Kossuth" (so says the description) is on exhibition in Rochester.

### Hush! Look after Searight.

Can order be brought out of chaos like this? Can any man who votes for the whig candidate tell what he votes for beyond a successful General?—Valley Spirit.

Those voting for Gen. Scott will then, at all events, according to your own admission, have the satisfaction of knowing that he is a successful Hero; but what satisfaction will Locofocos voting for Searight have?—That they voted, not for one who has fought and bled in defence of the country, but for one who according to his own statement to Hugh Keys has been guilty of forgery, and stands before the country a self convicted ignoramus.—Daily News.

### The Sword and the Crutch.

The Pottsville Emporium says that Gen. Pierce mounted his horse, and rushed into the battle of Churubusco; remaining in it till he fainted and was carried from the field.

The Kentucky Flag, on the other hand, says the gallant General entered the battle of Churubusco on foot, with a sword in one hand and a crutch in the other.

Now, from these harmonious facts, the important question arises, whether the Legislature of New Hampshire were not as much bound to present the intrepid General with an elegant crutch, as with an elegant sword.

The actual ordinary expenses of the whig government last year were a reduction upon the most favorable estimate of the Polk expenditure of more than \$5,000,000.

There is no reason to charge Gen. Pierce with lack of spirit or courage at Churubusco or Contreras.—*Alb. Argus.*

Nor at Marathon and Thermopylae, for the same reason—because he wasn't there!

A FRIEND of ours called in at our sanctum yesterday, to express his opinion that Pierce, after the Presidential election, would be very much in the predicament of the stick of candy he gave to the "boy who was a total stranger to him,"—licked, clear out of sight. We kicked the fellow out of the office, of course.—*Buffalo Rough Notes.*

A friend brought us in this morning a list of ten subscribers, seven of whom he declared from his own personal knowledge to have been Locofocos up to the nomination of General Scott. That is the way the ball rolls.—*Cincinnati Atlas.*

A revolution has broken out in the Society Island, and Queen Pomare has been forced to abdicate her throne.

**SCOTT ENTHUSIASM.**—Persons coming from above and below on the river, speak of the demonstrations of enthusiasm which they saw. All along the Kentucky shore and on the Indiana below and Ohio above, bonfires, illuminations and artillery were seen and heard, the most cheering evidences of joy appeared, making the very river vocal from shore to shore.—*Port. Clipper.*

### Gen. Pierce and Slavery.

The Washington Republic some time since published from two New Hampshire papers—The Manchester Democrat and the Independent Democrat—reports of a speech delivered by Gen. Pierce at New Boston, in which among other ultra expressions on the subject, declared that "he revolted at the giving up of a slave," and that "he loathed the fugitive slave law."—The Union, on their appearance in the Republic, denied that any such statements as were imputed to him in these reports had ever been uttered by Gen. Pierce.—Messrs. Norris, Pease and Hibbard, Democratic members of Congress from New Hampshire, also joined in this denial, and published a letter over their joint signatures, in which they say:—

"They (the Manchester Democrat and the Independent Democrat) are known to us to be now, and to have long been, avowedly and bitterly opposed to the principles and organization of the Democratic party generally, and particularly vindictive and mendacious in regard to General Pierce, before and since his nomination at Baltimore."

The editors of the Republic, not conceiving that the bold though vague denials of the Union and its colleagues settled the question of the authenticity of the reports, have procured further testimony.—The first is from the gentleman who reported Gen. Pierce's speech, and is to the following effect:

I, Andrew T. Foss, of Manchester, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the 2d day of January, 1852, I attended a political meeting at New Boston, in said county, which was addressed by General Franklin Pierce; that I went there for the purpose of reporting the speakers, and that the report of the speech of General Pierce, wherein he declares that he "loathed the Fugitive Slave Law," &c., was furnished by me to the editor of the Manchester Democrat; that the same was written out by me on the evening after the meeting, from notes taken on the spot; and that the facts therein stated, as published in said Manchester Democrat, and also in the Independent Democrat, are true. I distinctly recollect that General Pierce said, among other things, that he had a "most revolting feeling at the giving up a slave;" that he "loathed the Fugitive Slave Law;" and that the same "was opposed to humanity and moral right."

A. T. FOSS.

The second piece of evidence is a letter from Mr. John H. Goodall, editor of the Manchester Democrat, who avers that he had always been a Democrat, and is now opposed to General Scott, and that "two reports were made of General Pierce's speech, which correspond in every particular; and that the accuracy of the report in the Manchester Democrat was not denied by a single paper until the recent manifesto of the Washington Union."

It is worthy of note, in this connection, that whilst the Union so indignantly denies the reliability of these reports, and scorns them as a base forgery, the New York Post, true to its Free-soil proclivities, gives them full credence, commends General Pierce for the sentiments attributed to him, and calls exultingly for the production of more testimony of the same sort. May not the Southern Democrats, who are so loud in their proclamation of Gen. Pierce's fealty to the compromises of the Constitution, and soundness on the slavery question, see why it was that the Democratic Convention so steadily refused to announce its platform until after the nomination was made; and why it was that when that nomination had been made the Messrs. Van Buren, Butler, Dix, Rantoul, and a host of others, with their organ, the New York Post, wheeled into line.

### The Niagara Gathering.

According to all accounts, this was one of the most tremendous gatherings of Whigs ever known. They were there from all quarters, from all sections of the land, and the enthusiasm warrants the belief that a Whig triumph is certain.—The proceedings were deeply interesting, while the weather was of the most delightful character. It is estimated that there were not less than 100,000 persons assembled in the vicinity of the Falls.—The grounds selected for the celebration were conveniently located, and well adapted to the purpose. Those set apart for the encampment were on the easterly skirts of the town, about one hundred rods from the cataract. They were interspersed with fields and groves, extending from the Niagara River northward to a point some distance north of the Buffalo and Niagara Falls Railroad. They afforded ample room and accommodations for 100,000 persons. The military encampment and the grounds for the delegations were adjacent.

Among the distinguished Whigs present were Gov. Hunt of New-York, Gov. Johnson of Pennsylvania, Hon. G. W. Patterson, of New-York, Alvah Hunt, of New-York, Judge Mason and Judge Wright, of Ohio, Judge Jessup of Pennsylvania, &c. Delegations from fourteen States had been reported at noon on Tuesday. Over two hundred of Scott's old soldiers were on the ground, and by way of novelty some forty Tuscarora Indians who fought at Landry's Lane.

### Scott in the West.

"Comes from the West, in thunder tone,  
Hurrah, hurrah, hurrah!  
Scott is our best, our chosen one,  
Hurrah, hurrah, hurrah!  
East, West, North, and South—united shout,  
Their love for Graham and for Scott,  
Hurrah, hurrah, hurrah!"

The news from the West is of the most cheering character. A prominent citizen of Indiana, in a letter to a citizen in Maryland, says that "the Whigs are very sanguine of success;" that they "are raising Scott poles two hundred feet high in every direction;" that "the enthusiasm is greater than in 1840;" that "no doubt Indiana will go for Scott and Graham;" and that the Locofocos are "down in the mouth," and "give up the election."

Another citizen of the same State, who has always acted with the Democratic party, and been elected by them to several important offices, thus writes to a citizen of Washington—

I cannot and will not vote for Pierce—and many of my neighbors are of my opinion. I shall vote for Gen. Scott, and so will they. Ours is the second strongest Democratic county in the State, I believe, and I had a strong hand in making it so, as is well known here. I am of the opinion decidedly, that Indiana will go for Scott, notwithstanding you all think at Washington, I suppose, that Pierce will carry it.

The Cincinnati Gazette has the following on the same subject:

In Ohio we have everything in our favor. There is not a Whig county in Ohio where Scott's majority will not be much larger than Taylor's, nor a Democratic county in which Pierce can get Cass's majority.

Besides all this, there are other reasons which will have potent influence on his election, but which cannot be fully estimated till the campaign has further progressed.

We confidently hope for Indiana and Michigan, and do not yield Wisconsin, Iowa, and California. In fact, if the friends of Scott and Graham are as active and energetic as they ought to be, Scott's majority may be as large in proportion as that of Harrison, and in all probability will be larger than that of Taylor.

### Startling News.

The new editor of the Pennsylvania must be as verdant and credulous, as he is malignant and harmless in politics, else he would not have suffered some brainless Locofoco from this borough to impose upon him such absurd news as is contained in the following precious little paragraph, which we clip from his paper of Tuesday last:

"*Cherishing News from the Interior.*—From a letter received in this city from a friend in Montour county, we learn that the prospects of our Democratic nominees are quite flattering in that quarter. As an evidence of this, the letter notices among the changes in the borough of Danville, from the ranks of the Whigs, the following named citizens of that place, whom it is alleged have publicly avowed their intentions of supporting PIERCE and KING, viz:—

—DR. CLARENCE H. FRICK, a volunteer who served his country in the war with Mexico; GEO. A. FRICK, Cashier of the Danville Bank; HANCOCK & FOLEY, proprietors of the Rough and Ready Iron Works, and JOHN G. MONTGOMERY, Esq."

Now as far as regards Dr. FRICK and his father, GEO. A. FRICK, Esq., the Cashier of the Danville Bank, there are no warmer nor more efficient supporters of Gen. Scott in the whole Union, and the man who says to the contrary must be either an idiot, fool or rascal—and in regard to Messrs. Hancock & Foley, both of them have authorized us to say, that, although they take but little interest in the impending Presidential election, having too much business of their own to attend to meddle actively in the contest, neither of them will cast his vote for Pierce and King. As to John G. Montgomery, Esq., he has always voted with the Locos, unless it might have been on one or two occasions, when he was prompted to support Whigs from local causes, like a good many other Piercemens of this borough, who manfully helped us to elect Mr. Fuller to Congress in 1850.

The Pennsylvania, in due season, will probably hear from these new converts, and shall then see whether its managers will have the manliness to publish the truth for once. The cause that has to take refuge to such bare-faced, ridiculous falsehoods as the Pennsylvania promulgates, must be on its last legs, tottering on the brink of inevitable destruction.—We assure our friends abroad, that the Whigs of Danville and Montour county will give a good account of themselves next November. Gen. Scott has been among us, and the people know him. He led on our gallant volunteers in Mexico to battle and to victory, and they and their friends, whatever may be their party predilections, will not forsake him now.—*Danville Democrat.*

### Another Dose for Searight.

From the Pennsylvania Democrat.

MR. EDITOR:—The labored defence drawn up by Mr. Searight's lawyer, and published in the Sentinel and Genius, is so lame and flimsy as to require nothing more than a plain and simple statement, from a plain and common sense man, to completely refute.

I have vouchers to show, which cannot be disputed, and which any one can see that may desire it, that I actually expended on my contract on the Cumberland road, \$1,252 30 in cash; in addition I showed by positive testimony, that my son with my team was employed nearly the whole of two summers in hauling stone; so that my expenditures, together with a liberal allowance for my team, and a fair compensation for the stone, would amount to upwards of \$2000, exclusive of my own time and labor. The case was submitted to three respectable arbitrators; they gave me an award of upwards of \$1600, after deducting \$485 95, which I gave Mr. Searight credit for.

Having perfect confidence in the honesty and fairness of my claim, I afterwards agreed to submit the matter to the trustees of the road themselves. These trustees disregarding all my testimony, took the testimony of Mr. Searight, who for all the abovelabor, material and expenditure, allowed me \$583 98, which amount he covered by the credit which I admitted of \$483 95, and which was all he had claimed on the settlement of the account before the auditors, and an order of \$100 which I say was included in and receipted for in the above sum.

Now that the above and every order that he ever gave me was included in the \$483 95 is proven by Mr. Searight's own statement made out under oath.

The act of Assembly provides that "it shall be the duty of the said commissioner to render annually to the Court of Quarter Sessions of the respective counties through which the road passes, an account of the tolls received and expenses incurred on said road, on oath or affirmation, and publish the same in one or more newspapers in each county through which the road passes."

Under this act it will be seen that it was the duty of the road commissioner, annually to present under oath a full statement of his receipts and disbursements to the Court of Quarter sessions, and have this published in one or more newspapers.

In pursuance of this act, Mr. Searight presented to the court, what he states under oath to be a full account of his receipts and expenditures from the 1st day of May, 1842, to the last day of April, 1843. This account is approved by the Auditors January 31st 1844, and published in the Genius of Liberty Feb. 22d, 1844, and to which I would refer.

In this account, made out under oath as a full statement of his disbursements, Mr. Searight claimed that he paid me \$250 on my contract.

Again he presents to the court an account of his receipts and disbursements, from 1st day of May, 1843, to the 31st of December, 1844; at which time he was removed from office by Governor Shunk, and William Hopkins appointed in his place. This account also presented under oath as a correct statement of his disbursements was passed by the Auditors, and published in the Genius of Liberty, September 4th, 1845. In this account Mr. Searight claims to have paid me on my contract \$233 95, making in all \$483 95, just the amount for which I gave him credit.

But when Mr. Searight come before the trustees, he testified that he paid me \$583 95, and among other vouchers he produced an order drawn by himself in my favor, on Daniel Brown for \$100. I alleged that that order was included in the receipts which he held, and went to make up the sum of \$483 95, which I admitted he paid me. This he denied, and testified before the trustees that he was entitled to credit for the amount of this order in addition to the amount of the receipts, which he also presented.

Now I submit to an impartial public to decide which statement is true; which will you believe, my statement confirmed by the oath of Mr. Searight's testimony in opposition to his own oath and my most solemn assertion.

That Mr. Searight is mistaken in one or the other of these statements there can be no doubt. If it can be true, as he has positively sworn, that up to the 1st of December, 1845, the time he went out of office, and more than eighteen months after the date of the order he claims, he had not only paid me \$483 95, can it be true, as he testified before the trustees, that before the 31st of December, 1844, he had paid me \$583 95. Truth is mighty and will prevail. Notwithstanding the effort of Mr. Searight's counsel to gloss over this matter, yet there is something that even the ingenuity of counsel cannot explain away. Facts and figures are stubborn things which cannot lie, and all that is necessary to decide the matter at issue between Mr. Searight and myself in this case is to refer to his accounts, verified by his testimony as given before the trustees in the trial of our case.

As evidence that the counsel of Mr. Searight is mistaken, with regard to the order presented by him to the trustees, I present the following certificates which show clearly that the paper presented to the trustees was entirely different from that published in his attorney's communication.

We the undersigned, do hereby certify that we were present at the trial of the case of Hugh Graham, against William Searight, Commissioner of the Cumberland road. That William Searight presented an order on Daniel Brown for one hun-

dred dollars, for which he claimed a credit. This he said was the only order he had ever given said Brown, or the Good Intent Company. Said order was not endorsed by Ewing Brownfield, Pendleton, Long and Riley, or by any other person.

JAMES THOMPSON,  
JOHN SPRINGER,  
JAMES RODERICK,  
J. B. GRAHAM,  
A. KEYS,  
JOHN A. LITTLE.

On the trial between Graham and Searight an order was presented in behalf of Searight for one hundred dollars, which Graham denied, and stated that he received no order but what was receipted for, and I heard nothing of an endorsement on the order presented.

With regard to the fact of Hugh Keys being a partner of Mr. Searight in the Elk Creek job, or the Erie extension, and of Mr. Searight's refusal to account for money advanced, and profits, &c., the counsel of Mr. Searight complains that I did not make known the fact to the Governor of the Commonwealth. I would just say that I was not quite so green as to go to the Governor with a matter about which almost everybody knew, and had become so common among those connected with the public works, that it was hardly thought either disreputable or criminal. But this same writer says, "I have concealed this information too long, more than ten years after the ground had closed over Mr. Keys." But in this the writer, as in many other parts of his communication, has shown himself ignorant of the facts. Instead of concealing this fact in my own bosom, as he remarks, as soon as I was appointed guardian of the minor children of my deceased friend, which is some eight years ago, I called on Mr. Searight for a settlement, and on his refusal to pay over what I believed to be justly coming to Mr. Keys' children, I brought suit. Up to this time Mr. Searight and myself were friends, but I considered that I owed a duty to the children of him, who as the defender of Mr. Searight says, "was my friend and countryman," and I fearlessly performed it; and it was for this, as I remarked before, Mr. Searight said he would "put his thumb on me," and for which he has put his thumb on me with a vengeance to the amount of a good many hundred dollars. Had it not been for this we should still have been friends, and he would have paid me the amount fairly coming on my contract, which would have been about \$1600 more than I got. Yet this apologetic of Mr. Searight says that I retained this fact in my own bosom, notwithstanding the record of the court shows a suit pending for this very matter for years.

But this writer in his remarks in relation to Mr. Searight's letter to Mr. Keys, shows the fallacy and shifts to which even an ingenious Lawyer may be driven in defending a bad cause. After many lamentations over the liberty taken with the dead, says that there was an understanding between Keys and Mr. Searight, by which "they frequently signed the names of each other to checks and other papers, and that this was the fact in relation to the note referred to in Mr. Searight's letter, that it was done by the express authority of Mr. Keys." If this was the fact, why does Mr. Searight say, "as I was guilty for forgery by signing your name to this note, and the Penitentiary staring me in the face, I thought best to release you from the bank, and have taken all the responsibility on myself, but if ever I do such an act again, damn me." Mr. Searight knew well that if he had been authorized by Mr. Keys, to sign his name to the note he would not be guilty of forgery, and would be in no danger of the Penitentiary. If Mr. Keys had authorized him to sign his name to the note, he would not likely have released Mr. Keys from the bank and taken all the responsibility on himself, at a time too, when he supposed he would have had the whole note to pay. If it was nothing more than the simple innocent act of a man signing the name of his friend by his express authority, why does Mr. Searight in view of this most innocent act exclaim with so much earnestness, "if ever I do such an act again, damn me."

The defence is so barefaced and void of plausibility that no one but a lawyer would have the hardihood to present it to an enlightened community. But like the figures in his account, and his testimony before the trustees, there stands his letter, his own admission in black and white, they speak for themselves, and require no comment from me to make them stronger, and no sophistry of counsel can wipe them out. There they are and there they must stand.

But Hugh Keys and Hugh Graham, have not been the only persons in this community who Mr. Searight has drawn in under the garb of friendship and defrauded, deceived, and betrayed. I am not however, going to write the history of his villainies, it would take too much of my time, and, require too great a space in your paper, but if any one has any curiosity to hear further developments of this score, among others that I could name, I would merely refer them to Mr. John Gadd, R. T. Henderson, and Thomas McKean, not one of whose democracy will be doubted, as mine has been attempted to be, by even the Editor of the Genius, Mr. Searight's son.

Enough however for the present,—if occasion requires, you may perhaps hear from me again. HUGH GRAHAM.

N. S. Townsend, the Democratic Representative in Congress from the 14th Ohio District, refuses to support Pierce or the Platform. The disaffection in the Locofoco ranks is broad and deep.

The Massachusetts State Prison has 491 inmates, of which number 20 are in for life