

From the Savannah Republican.  
GEN. PIERCE AND SLAVERY.

Mass. Editors.—What are Gen. Pierce's views in relation to "the institution of slavery?" Has he never expressed opinions and feelings concerning slavery which no Southern man can sanction?

In a speech, revised and written out by himself, and published in the Appendix to the Congressional Globe, 2d session, 25th Congress, page 54, (no speeches are published in that work but such as are revised by the members who deliver them) he used this language:

"I have no hesitation in saying that I consider slavery a social, political, and moral evil, and most sincerely wish it had no existence on the face of the earth."

Now how many Southern men concur with Gen. Pierce in the belief that slavery is a social and political evil; and how many join him in the "most sincere wish" that it had no existence on the face of the earth? Do his supporters in Georgia concur with him? If they do, it is their duty, as honest men, to organize a party in favor of voting out from among us this "social and political evil." If they do not concur with him, how can they consistently support him?

Again—we have undoubted authority—no abolition, or whig papers—but the authority of his own accredited organs, for saying that he HATES and DEPLORES slavery—yes as much as an abolitionist. Now for the proof:

Shortly after his nomination he appeared in the Boston Post in the organ of Gen. Pierce's party in Massachusetts, an elaborate biographical sketch of the General, written by the Editor of the Post—at least it has usually been ascribed to his pen—that sketch was transferred to the Washington Union of June 28th, and endorsed by the Editor as a "very able and well written notice of General Pierce," and "commended to the attention of his readers."

Now it is the vocation of the Union to advocate the claims of Gen. Pierce as a candidate for the Presidency—to defend him against the attacks of his opponents, and to give the representations of his views and opinions, which may obtain currency. No one can charge the Union with misrepresenting Gen. Pierce, particularly on the question of slavery, on which it takes special pains to prove him sound in its estimation of his Southern supporters, and in its biography of Gen. Pierce, published in the Boston Post, and re-published in the Union, there is a sketch of a speech delivered by him on the 20th of last November at Manchester, (not in January at New Boston, be it recollected—the two speeches must not be confounded.) The meeting was held at Manchester, and Gen. Pierce was one of the Union meetings, which was called at that period in order to give a pledge of fidelity to the Union, the Constitution, and the laws—and the General's speech is quoted to prove his fidelity to the Union, and show his boldness in rebuking the abolitionists, and those whom were present, and from whom the speech was mainly addressed. I quote from his speech as reported in the Post and Union. He said, "the men in the hall, who had abandoned themselves to the infatuation of disunion sentiments will probably live to regret any repentance in their present course. I have no doubt that, in the infirmities of age shall have crept upon them, they would gather their children around them and confess how they were once betrayed into MORAL TREASON, and as a legacy, say to them, 'Stand up, Union and stand by your Country.' (We then, the Southern Rights Democrats and Whigs, many of whom last year were open disunionists, of that declaration.) According to Gen. Pierce, they were guilty of "moral treason." Are they not now his supporters?

But to continue from the General's speech: "What, said he, did not deplore slavery? But what sound thinking mind regarded that as the only evil which could rest upon the land. The men who would dissolve the Union, did not HATE or DEPLORE slavery MORE than he did; but even with it, we had lived in peace, prosperity, and security from the foundation of our institutions to the present day."

These extracts are sufficient to show General Pierce's strong anti-slavery feelings—that he "hates slavery as much as an abolitionist." The disunionists whom he addressed were abolitionists, and not Southern Rights secessionists. He told them that he "hated" or "deplored" slavery more than he does. Well, if that is not hating slavery strong enough and hard enough, will some of his Southern Rights friends tell us how much harder and stronger he ought to hate it to entitle himself to the support of Southern men? Has Gen. Scott ever said anything of the kind? Has he ever "hated" or "deplored" slavery as much as an abolitionist? Tell me that, ye who can.

AN UP-COUNTRY WHIG.

MODERN DEMOCRACY.

Modern Democracy takes many shapes, and assumes all the colors of a chameleon. No circumstances can arise, to which it will not readily accommodate itself. It can be Dorism in Rhode Island, Abolitionism in Massachusetts, anti-unionism in New York, or attempted nullification of solemn treaties and laws of the United States, as was witnessed in the city of New York last week, repudiation in Mississippi, secessionism in South Carolina, and filibustering in Louisiana! And then, the leaders of all these factions, from the hot-beds of puritanical fanaticism in the North, to the warm springs of National Convention, and pass an incongruous and contradictory series of resolutions, some apparently pro-slavery, and then adopt the Kentucky resolutions, which virtually declare the Fugitive Slave Law void, and of no effect, and the last Democratic National Convention (did) declare the whole to be unadulterated Democracy, and call upon "the faithful" throughout the land to rally to the support of the same, and the candidates which are put forward under it.

It is but a few days since we noticed an article in the Democratic Review, the recognized organ of "Young America," proclaiming in favor of the annexation of Canada, Cuba, and all "contiguous islands and territories," and the Kansas doctrine, and stating that all was destined to be "the work of Frank Pierce!" May the Lord save the Union from his election, if such are to be the consequences of his elevation! Surely, his reign would be an era of war, bloodshed, distress, impoverishment, and general demoralization.

"A man is known by the company he keeps," as well as by those who set themselves up as his principal champions and supporters. The principal leaders of all the above factions, are strong friends of Pierce. These facts, taken in connection with certain well known tendencies of his mind, seem to make him a man most unfit to fill the responsible office of President of the United States. This country would witness troublous times when a weak-minded agrarian, who constructs the obligations of law, of the constitution, and of treaties, and who shall fill the executive chair. This country needs a man who will reverse the organic law of the land, who will respect the prerogatives of either department of the government, who will enforce laws and treaties according to their spirit and letter, and who believes in and will carry out the wise and beneficent doctrines of the immortal Father of his Country—a man similar to Millard Fillmore or to Winfield Scott.

We have been led into these reflections, by seeing a paragraph in an exchange, which stated that, on a late visit of Gen. Pierce to Rhode Island, the first man he called on was the notorious Governor Dorr. The Alexandria Telegraph publishes an extract from the Providence Herald, a paper edited by Dorr, in which he refers to his interview, and speaks of the friendship of Pierce for his cause. Rhode Island! He says:

"I had the pleasure of an interview with him. He is in fine health and high spirits, and had an excellent campaign in him. Being a thorough good, practical Democrat, and a man of and among the people, and knowing what

United Democracy can do, he commits himself cheerfully to their hands. When our conversation was turned to some of the affairs of 1842, and his well known friendship for the Rhode Island cause of sovereignty and self-rule, we took the liberty of speaking of our democratic Democratic candidate for the Presidency. What a beautiful spectacle the contemplation of the whole presents! Gaze upon it, Americans!

[From the Republic.]

The Republic admits the "frankness" of General Pierce's disclaimer of the words imputed to him by Foss, and also admits that his "personal character" is of great credit to his disclaimer. In the face of these admissions, and of the published testimony of the meeting itself, the Republic persists in its charge, upon no other authority than the pretended report of an abolitionist, who is admitted to know nothing about the matter. Plainly, this is the conduct of a man who no longer expects to be able to deny his conspiracy!

Of a piece with this, and tending in the same manner to a confession of the conspiracy, is the pettifogging effort of the Republic to shift the issue in the case, to rely upon the resolutions heretofore adopted by the Union, which are in no way connected, and to make capital out of the circumstances under which General Pierce's letter comes before the public. All this has nothing to do with the question, and we do not propose to discuss it.

[Question of yesterday.]

The above are the material paragraphs of the only article which the Union has ventured to insert in regard to General Pierce's defensive letter. They amount to a begging of one portion of the question and a surrender of another; and are altogether founded upon a pitiful perversion of the articles already in the hands of our readers.

Our "admissions" did not bear the construction upon them by the Union. We said that the letter had the semblance of frankness, and that the character of its author as a man—not as a politician—might be as excellent as his friends allege it to be. We said that the case now undergoing trial before the country, "personal character" could have little or no weight when balanced against the mass of originating testimony. We showed that the charge, though primarily resting on the statements of Mr. Foss, is fully sustained by other witnesses, and by the entire home character of General Pierce and his friends. In existing circumstances, we attach as much credence to Mr. Pierce's "disclaimer" as we should to Mr. VAN BUREN'S, or no more.

The "shifting of the issues" has no reality out of the brain of our contemporary. We reiterated the first issue arising out of the New Boston speech, and we reiterate it again, with the full conviction not only that General PIERCE has not met it, but that his smooth evasion, under the guise of "frankness," adds immensely to the force of the case against him. He has not dared to meet it. He has not touched one of the points involved. He has not attempted to give a specific denial to any one of the Abolitionist expressions that are imputed to him. The whole force of the letter lies in its evasion of distinct allegations, and its devices to effect a general denial of the high-sounding but vague and worthless generalities.

But the "issues" are not to be set aside because the Union has not the fairness or the courage to encounter them. They are relevant to the first issue, and not less important. They are relevant to the entire case. They are relevant to the character of the man. They are relevant to the character of the man. They are relevant to the character of the man.

The ill-affected nonchalance with which the Union acknowledges these portions of the question is very striking. It has not dared to say in defence of Messrs. NORRIS, HIBBARD, PIERCE, and the other political sponsors of General PIERCE. It tacitly concedes that they are as darkly dyed in Freesoilism as any Freesoilers in the country. It concedes that the New Hampshire Democracy are as hostile to the South as we have alleged them to be. It concedes that General PIERCE has, at other places than New Boston, delivered himself of all the Freesoil avowals which stand on record against him. The Union virtually concedes all this, and tries to escape further trouble by remarking, "it has nothing to do with the question, and we do not propose to discuss it. We are content to let it stand as it does. All our points are gained. The South will have the satisfaction of knowing that the Union admits the whole of them."

GEN. SCOTT'S QUARRELS.

The Argus seems very anxious to have the world know with whom Gen. Scott has "quarrelled." While its hand is in it, it should have told its readers whose quarrels Gen. Scott has settled. There was a "quarrel" once, between England and the United States. No man was more efficient than Gen. Scott in settling that "quarrel." There was subsequently a "quarrel" threatened between our Government and the Cherokees. He settled that quarrel promptly, wisely, and humanely. There was a "quarrel" also with Black Hawk. That also was settled. The Argus may also have heard of the "quarrel" with South Carolina. General Scott amicably adjusted that "quarrel," as he also, did the "quarrel" on our North-Eastern and Canada borders; and last, though not least, by his skill and courage, he settled our recent "quarrel" with Mexico.

For every personal "quarrel" the Argus can prove Gen. Scott to have instigated, we will agree to prove a national "quarrel" that he has settled.

The only important "quarrels" in which we remember Gen. Pierce to have been engaged were his "quarrels" with American Industry, River and Harbor Improvements, the Widows of the Soldiers of the war of 1812, and the venerable Widow of the lamented Gen. Harrison.

ALBANY EVENING JOURNAL.

FREE COLORED CONVENTION.—This body, recently in session in Baltimore, adjourned on the 28th ult., to meet on the second Monday in November, 1853, at Frederick, Md. Resolutions were adopted recommending the formation of societies and establishments of schools throughout the State, and the appointment of persons to collect information relative to the condition of colored emigrants in Canada, West Indies, Guiana and Liberia. The following resolution contained a bitter truth for the Abolitionists to ponder on:

Resolved, That while we appreciate and acknowledge the sincerity of the motives and the activity of the zeal of those who, during an agitation of twenty years, have honestly struggled to place on a footing of social and political equality with the white population of the country, yet we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that no advancement has been made towards a result to us so desirable; but that, on the contrary, our condition as a class is less desirable now than it was twenty years ago.

HON. E. C. CABELL, OF FLORIDA.—We believe it has been generally understood that Mr. Cabell, of Florida, would refuse to support Gen. Scott. The Tallahassee Sentinel gives an extract from a letter recently written by him, which says: "The Whig party of my State have decided to sustain him (Gen. Scott), and I will acquiesce in that decision. I certainly cannot support Gen. Pierce, and agree with you as to the probable consequences of his election."

ALBANY JOURNAL.

From the National Intelligencer.  
DEVELOPMENT OF INSECT LIFE.

LETTER FROM F. B. OGDEN, ESQ., AMERICAN CONSUL, AT LIVERPOOL, TO HIS FRIEND IN WASHINGTON.

I not long since made a very interesting acquaintance, Mr. Andrew Cross, of Somersetshire, well known in the scientific world as one of the first electricians of the age. He is a man of high mind and means to abstract science, at the same time cultivating a refined taste for literature and poetic composition. His father was an intimate friend of Dr. Franklin. He was the village Hampden of the day, and transmitted all his liberal sentiments to his son. He invited me to his Manor House, about forty miles distant. We were most cordially received by him and his accomplished wife. We were made at home at once, and found in a select few (like ourselves invited guests) a delightful society.—Mr. Cross has given great attention to animal electricity. He has surrounded his house by a conducting wire, elevated sixty and seventy feet on poles, with metallic points to attract the fluid, making a circuit of some three thousand feet. All the collected electricity is brought into his laboratory, and is there as subservient to his manœuvres, as if he ruled the cannon. A heavy thunder storm came on while I was there. The discharges between balls, an inch apart, were in rapid succession, and like the firing of so many pistols, each one of which would have killed an ox. It was tremendous; but in an instant, the balls being brought into contact, the whole fluid was conducted into a pond of water a few yards off. Under such protection, it is impossible that his house should be struck by lightning.

Some of Mr. Cross's chemical discoveries are of great practical importance. We witnessed a great variety of interesting experiments—the formation of artificial crystals, various stages, and the arrest of putrescence by galvanic action, which is applied with great advantage to tanning. He placed a pair of fresh soles in a cistern of water, through which there was a constant flow of galvanic fluid, there he left them until he had taken out the skin, and a cook was called on to examine them. Mr. Cross pretending to doubt whether they were quite fresh. "They have not been two days caught," was his reply; "but when I skin them I can tell you positively." Her report was that they were as fresh as the day they were caught. In the same manner, Mr. Cross and a scientific friend being the only ones in the secret. They were served without comment to the guests, and both the gentlemen tasted them with great curiosity. A young lady made the first remark, "Why, what a curious fish; it has not the least taste in it; it is like boiled cod." This was the fact. All the essential oil had been destroyed, and it was left an insipid mass.

But the most wonderful of all his experiments is that which has created such a sensation as would have made a Galileo of him in former times. The means have been doubted by some and positively denied by others. His reality has been abundantly proved by various experiments. Mr. Cross laughs at the idea that he ever pretended to create animal life. He has only promoted its development by accidentally bringing together the mysterious causes. On having done so, he has seen the result, and called it "the Vestiges of Creation," the author of which still remains as much in umbra as Junius himself. In it there is some notion taken of this wonderful development. I own to utter incredulity until I had the opportunity of a full examination of the means. No room was left for doubt. No delusion, no self-deception, no favorite hypothesis to be carried out, had any influence in the result. On first witnessing it Mr. Cross would not believe his own senses. He looked at it with a incredulous eye, and then he opened his eyes to assure himself that he was not laboring under some illusion. On his return he held the actual living insect in various stages of its formation. The apparatus was prepared for the purpose of producing crystals from the silicate of potash.

A tubulated retort, with its long end plunged in a glass dish of mercury, has a platinum wire passing through it, connected with a negative pole of a weak galvanic battery. Through a neck in the retort hermetically sealed, another platinum wire, immersed in the caustic solution, communicates with the positive pole. The bulb of the retort is two-thirds filled with the most carefully prepared caustic solution of silica and potash. Pure black flints and caustic soda, after being subjected to a white heat, are pulverized and melted into a glass, which is soluble in distilled water. In this solution no animal life can possibly exist. The apparatus was then placed upon a shelf for constant inspection. A gelatinous substance was first observed to have formed around the bottom of the positive wire. Then No. 1 made its appearance, gradually expanding into Nos. 2 and 3, when flexible filaments were observed. No. 4 was then seen, and the whole was then dried and forty days' watching through all its changes, the perfect living insect crawled up the wire; not singly, but in sufficient numbers to dispel all doubt, if any could have existed, and prepared for another stage of life. Like our human embryo, it was first formed in a tube, in which they are produced, and are drawn in if they return, an unfortunate stranger that missed his hold immediately perished. The Acarus Crocei is now known as a distinct species.

MURDER OF A WIFE BY HER HUSBAND AND SISTER-IN-LAW.

On Saturday afternoon, about 4 o'clock, a laboring man named Patrick Grant, went to his house, in Sixty-seventh-street, between the Sixth and Seventh avenues, in a state of intoxication, and commenced abusing his wife, Ann Grant, in the most violent manner. It appears the sister of Grant was in the family, and owing to some difficulty arising between the two females, Patrick took sides with his sister, and used the wife in the most cruel manner, on this, as well as previous occasions. During the attack made by the brutal husband upon the woman on Saturday, she remonstrated with him, though without effect, and he finally resorted to blows with his fist. He knocked her down and then inflicted serious injuries, by stamping and kicking her in various parts of the body. The sister of the wretch also assisted in beating the unfortunate female, and the neighbors hearing her cries, procured a Nineteenth Ward Police officer, who hastened to the premises and found the injured woman lying on the floor unable to speak, and the blood flowing from the mouth and wounds. The husband and sister-in-law of the victim, named Sarah Grant, were immediately arrested and committed to prison by Justice Stewart. The injured woman was conveyed to the Bellevue Hospital, where she lingered up to last evening, and died of the internal injuries received. Coroner Ives was notified, and will investigate the affair to-day.

NEW YORK TIMES.

WHAT IS A FOP?—A Mr. Stark, in a lecture before the Young Men's Association, of Troy, N. Y., gave a definition of the fop.

"The fop is a complete specimen of an outside philosopher. He is one-third collar, one-fourth patent leather, one-fourth walking stick, and the rest gloves and hair. As to his remote ancestry there is some doubt, but it is pretty well settled that he is the son of a tailor's goose. He becomes estatic at the smell of new cloth. He is somewhat nervous and to dream of a tailor's bill gives him the nightmare. By his air one would judge he had been dipped like Achilles; but it is evident that the goddess held by the head instead of the heels. Nevertheless, such men are useful.—If there were no tailors there would be no fops. They are not so entirely to blame for being sequestered to externals. Paste diamonds make them a splendid setting to make them sell. Only if they do seem a waste of material to put \$5 worth of beaver on five cents worth of brains."

THE RALEIGH REGISTER.

"Ours are the plans of fair, delightful peace; Unwarped by party rage, to live like brothers."

RALEIGH, N. C.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, AUG. 25, 1852.

REPUBLICAN WHIG TICKET.

FOR PRESIDENT,  
GEN. WINFIELD SCOTT,  
OF NEW JERSEY.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,  
WILLIAM A. GRAHAM,  
OF NORTH CAROLINA.

ELECTION ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2d.

Republican Whig Electoral Ticket.

FOR THE STATE AT LARGE,  
HENRY W. MILLER, OF WAKE.

1st. District, GEO. W. BAXTER,  
2d. do.  
3d. do. RALPH GORRELL,  
4th. do.  
5th. do. HENRY K. NASH,  
6th. do. M. W. RANSOM,  
7th. do. JNO. WINSLOW,  
8th. do.  
9th. do. DAVID A. BARNES.

"I have been asked if I liked this Fugitive Slave Law: I answered NO, I LOATHED IT. I HAVE A MOST REVOLTING FEELING AT THE GIVING UP OF A SLAVE—THE LAW IS OPPOSED TO HUMANITY."—Gen. Pierce, 2d November, 1852.

Again, Gen. Pierce, in a speech, made by him while in the United States Senate—See Globe, 2d Session, 25th Congress, page 64—says:

"I have no hesitation in saying that I consider Slavery a SOCIAL AND POLITICAL EVIL, and MOST SINCERELY WISH it had no existence on the face of the earth."

SCOTT AND GRAHAM CLUB.

There will be a meeting of the Scott and Graham Club, at the Court House, this (Tuesday) evening, at 8 o'clock.

BY ORDER OF THE PRESIDENT.

ELECTOR FOR THE STATE AT LARGE.

The Whig Executive Committee, after interchanging opinions with, and consulting the wishes of the Whigs in various sections of the State, have selected HENRY W. MILLER, Esq., as the Whig Candidate for Elector in behalf of the State at large.

The Committee have further concluded to appoint an Assistant Elector for the State at large, in each Congressional District. Their names will be announced as soon as the Whigs in the several Districts can be consulted.

J. H. JOYNT, Chairman.

J. H. HAUGHTON,  
R. B. GILLIAM,  
D. S. HILL,  
J. W. EVANS,  
H. K. NASH,  
E. J. HALE,  
D. A. BARNES.

THE LATE ELECTION.

We omit, to-day, the publication of the two tables, showing the result of the recent State Elections. As soon as the official majority is ascertained, we shall re-publish the Table showing the gubernatorial vote.

Parties in the Legislature stand as announced in our last. The locofocos have a majority of four in the Senate and the Whigs a majority of four in the House—making a present tie on joint ballot. The result in Camden and Currituck is still undecided. We learn from the "Pioneer," that Shaw's (loco) maj. in Currituck is 188, and Barnard's (Whig) in Camden 187. The "Pioneer," referring to the fact that certain votes for Shaw, put into the wrong box by mistake, were counted (and upon this ground the Sheriff of Camden, we learn, refuses a certificate of election to Shaw), says:

"These votes were cast as follows: A voter presented his ticket for the Senate—the inspector put the ticket in the wrong box. This was immediately detected. The Whig inspector admitted the error, and, upon a conference, it was agreed that the name should be registered properly, and when the votes were counted, out this one should be placed in the proper box.—The other case was precisely similar.

Here we have the grounds on which the Sheriff of Currituck has given a certificate of election to Dr. Shaw. On the same grounds Simon H. Rogers, Esq., might have claimed a certificate from the Sheriff of Wake; but neither he nor his friends have ever thought of such a course. The consent of a Whig inspector could not legalize what is in itself clearly illegal.

At the time of commenting, in our last, upon a late paragraph which made its appearance, unaccompanied to any other source, in the "Fayetteville Carolinian," we had not seen the following explanation which has appeared in that journal. We insert it, now, with pleasure, as an act of justice to the Editor:—

"In our last week's paper there was an article copied from the Providence Herald headed 'Gen. Scott's misfortune.' No credit was given for the article, for its facts were supposed to be merely historical. An error occurred, however, in setting up the types, by which Gen. Scott is represented as surrendering with a force of 7640, when it should have been 764.—The additional 0 was purely a typographical error. We do not read the proof sheets of our selected matter, and consequently were not aware of this mistake until our attention was called to it by the Fayetteville Observer. We now publish the correction, and as its circulation will be commensurate with that of the error, no injury will be inflicted on Gen. Scott. Under these circumstances, we must protest against any interference as to 'what locofocoism will descend to carry a party election.'"

As an act of justice to our proof-reader, we must be permitted to say that, having some fear of a mistake, he looked for the article in question, but it had, been somehow mislaid, and he was unable to find it. Under the circumstances it should have been omitted, and was only inserted on account of the confusion and disturbance almost always present in a newspaper printing office during the excitement of a close-contested election.

The Boston Daily Advertiser says, that the President of the late treasonable Free Soil Abolition Convention at Pittsburgh was "Henry Wilson, being at the same time President of the Senate of Massachusetts; which office he now holds by virtue of the votes of all the Democratic Senators of Massachusetts, having been chosen with the approbation of the whole Democratic party in the Legislature."

THE PIERCE LETTER OF DENIAL.

This production reminds one of the non-committal epistles of the author's wily friend and associate, Martin Van Buren! We heard a locofoco declare, a few days since, that "it was very ingeniously written." No doubt of this. To a superficial reader, it would appear, at the first blush, to be a direct denial of all the charges contained in the Bill of Indictment against Pierce. But upon close inspection, it will be seen, that it denies nothing—that it is in no part satisfactory. So general is it in its terms, that the plainest man in the nation would pronounce it a cunning attempt to evade the issue.

Why did not Pierce tell in substance what he did say? As he has become a witness for himself, why did he not tell the whole truth? Why did he simply answer the leading questions put to him? He had a good opportunity to say whether he was for or against the Fugitive Slave Law—and he had also the very best chance to answer the question propounded by Scott, of Richmond, whether he will, if elected, vote a bill repealing or modifying, so as to weaken, that law! This he has not done. So he will not do. He has already evaded this issue, and he will continue to do to the last. By such a course he expects to keep together his freesoil allies. He is pandering to them and other prejudices. The Rev. Mr. Foss swore to the fact that Pierce did use the expressions attributed to him in his New Boston speech. He was the Reporter and was paying strict attention. His report of the speech was published and circulated in January last, throughout the State of New Hampshire, and no one thought of denying publicly its accuracy, until Pierce's double dealing was exposed about a month since. One account of the speech was published in Concord, immediately under the eyes and nose of Pierce.

Yet he did not do this or deny its correctness! Why was this? There are many strong facts and circumstances which go to corroborate the statement of Foss. The freesoil papers in Ohio that sustain Pierce have stereotyped the speech for the campaign, and are circulating it as genuine. They say Pierce did use the expressions, and therefore they go for him. They denounce the Northern men who attempt to rob them of the "honor" of having made such a speech as dough-faces, sold to the slave power of the South!

This letter will not do! The South is not to be humbugged any longer by the "soft-soldier" of such a "Yankee Freesoiler." They remember the Arch-magician, and if they suffer themselves to be fooled again, the hand of resurrection can't save them!

GEN. SCOTT'S SERVICES AND PAY.

Mr. Meriwether (the one month Senator from the State of Kentucky) introduced a Resolution a few days since, calling on the President to furnish the Senate with a statement of all the moneys ever received by Gen. Scott for his long public services. It was opposed by Messrs. Butler and Stockton, two locofoco Senators, as unworthy the character and dignity of the body. The former declared that Gen. Scott had richly earned every cent which he had ever received, and that his poverty was the best answer to the imputations implied in the Resolution. The locos voted down amendments which were intended to ascertain particulars in reference to Gen. Pierce.

In referring to the action of the Senate on this Resolution, the "Richmond Whig" remarks:

But who are the honorable Senators, who are begrudging to Scott the emolument which his country, for great deeds, has bestowed upon him? They are no doubt persons very fearful lest a cent of the public money should be taken without adequate service! Scott's pay has been out of all proportion to his services! His ten pitched battles, his preserving peace on the Canadian frontier—the Northern frontiers, his saving us from civil war—his treaty with the North Western Indians—his fearless exposure of life for the good and glory of his country—his body riddled by British bullets—cost a great deal more than they were worth! Very well, let us see what his assistants charge for their services. First and foremost on the list is Mr. Atchison, of Missouri. We find, that this nice adjuster of services and pay charged the Government and people of the United States by way of constructive mileage, \$1600 for one night's rest in Washington! General Scott did not receive so much as that for the battle of Chippewa—when the British were first taught to yield to inferior number and cold steel.—Next comes Mr. Borland, of Arkansas, who for just such laborious work as Mr. Atchison's one night's quiet rest in Washington, received \$1800. No doubt, double as much as Scott got for his blood and life in the battle of New Orleans. We have Mr. Clemens, of Alabama—who pocketed \$1040 of the public money for the same service. That was cheap. Then Dodge, of Iowa, \$1440—Dodge of Wisconsin, \$1584—each for one night's rest. Next we have that impecunious A. D. Douglas, who is such an advocate of economy—such an abhorrer of public plunder—he contented himself with \$1083 for one night's sleep in Washington! That was better earned than the pacification of the Canadian frontier! Next comes Downs, of Louisiana, and the French Republican, Soule—one \$2240, and the other \$2074—mighty men for purity and economy! And yet they charged the people more for one night's sleep than General Scott received for five victories in the Valley of Mexico.

The "Whig" has not given half the names of those very "economical" Senators who received their constructive mileage. There were 25 Senators who did not leave Washington City between the night of the 3d and the morning of the 4th March, 1851, but pocketed thousands of dollars of the public money. Of the 25 there were only three Whigs, who received about \$2,000 in all, and twenty-two locofocos, who received \$33,226! Gwin, of California, pocketed the sum of \$4,008, Norris, the freesoil friend of Pierce, the sum of \$470, Rusk, the sum of \$2074, Houston, the sum of \$2790!

There were 24 Senators who refused to receive pay for services never rendered—to be refunded what they had never spent in the public service, are itching to have the accounts of Gen. Scott published, that they may find something therein to carp at and electioneer with! Let them pull the beam out of their own eyes. Six of their number received \$14,000 for sleeping one night in Washington City—ten times as much as Scott received for all the splendid battles he fought at the City of Mexico.

Shame upon such men!

The President of the late treasonable Free Soil Abolition Convention at Pittsburgh was "Henry Wilson, being at the same time President of the Senate of Massachusetts; which office he now holds by virtue of the votes of all the Democratic Senators of Massachusetts, having been chosen with the approbation of the whole Democratic party in the Legislature."

THE "YANKEE FREESOILER" AND HIS ALLIES.

The proofs are overwhelming that Gen. Pierce, if elected President, will be "a nose of wax" in the hands of the rankest and vilest Freesoilers and Abolitionists at the North. One of his most ardent supporters is C. F. Cleveland, a member of Congress from Connecticut. We invite attention to the following letter from this "ally" and friend of Pierce, written in 1849. It speaks volumes against the soundness of his second "Northern man with Southern feelings."

"HARTFORD, March 10, 1849.  
H. HAMMOND, Esq.—DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 8th inst. regarding me, is received, and the questions which you propounded, is received, and I embrace the first opportunity afforded you, to forward you a reply.

"Without my knowledge and against my wishes, a Convention of my friends assembled at Norwich, on the 15th of February last, placed in nomination for I AM AN REPRESENTATIVE in the next Congress of the United States for this District, and you inquire of me whether, if elected (an improbable event by the way) I will sustain that measure which proposes to exclude slavery from the Territories of New Mexico and California? Whether I will do all in my power to abolish slavery, and the slave against the District of Columbia? And whether I am opposed to, and will continue to oppose, in all constitutional ways, the admission of any more slave States into the Union?

"To these inquiries I have to reply that entertaining no doubt of the power of Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories, and in favor of the exercise, in such manner as will effectually prevent the introduction of slavery and its attendant evils into New Mexico and California, and into any Territory of the United States now free. That regarding the existence of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, I AM AN ABOLITIONIST, and I AM IN FAVOR OF THEIR ABOLITION in the most easy, speedy, and practicable manner, by the action of Congress. And being uncompromisingly opposed to the extension of slavery beyond the limits within which it now exists, I could never consent to the admission of any more slave States into the Union."

"I have examined the resolutions composed in the platform of the Convention, and I think them to be democratic. One of these resolutions is in relation to cheap postage, &c., and another in relation to the disposition which should be made of the Public Lands. These resolutions are, in my judgment, eminently just, and truly democratic. I CAN, THEREFORE, VERY CHEERFULLY SUBSCRIBE TO THE DOCTRINES THEY CONTAIN."

"I have thus briefly, though I believe fully answered the several inquiries which you have been pleased to propound to me. And it only remains for me to say that should I be honored with an election to the post, which I have been nominated to, I shall be as faithfully and fearlessly asserted and faithfully defended."

"Very respectfully,  
"C. F. CLEVELAND."

It will be seen from this letter that Cleveland endorsed the Buffalo Platform, was for the Wilnot Proviso, and in favor of abolishing Slavery in the District of Columbia!

Mr. Van Buren, it will be remembered, was nominated by the Buffalo Convention, and ran as the Freesoil candidate. He now sustains Pierce—and so do all his clan.

Now, what in 1848 thought the "Cass Democracy" of Van Buren and his Buffalo friends? We appeal to the "Union" of that date. Read the following extracts from that leading Locofoco Journal:

"From the Union of August 18, 1848.  
"Can they [the Democrats of New York] witness the proceedings of the Buffalo Convention without regretting the preference given to Mr. Van Buren, and to the champion of such a disgusting coalition, to gratify his ambition or to satiate his revenge?"

"The Democrats of the State of New York have every motive that can animate high-minded patriots to resist the preference given to Mr. Van Buren, and to the champion of such a disgusting coalition, to gratify his ambition or to satiate his revenge!"

"Both parties are deservedly indignant at the movement, (the Buffalo resolutions) because it is calculated to build up a new northern party, and to divide the Union into two geographical interests."

"From the Union of August 24, 1848.  
"But there is one feature in the disgusting prouettes of this man, [Martin Van Buren] which marks his character. We do not speak of the motley and monstrous character of the Convention to which he owes his nomination, DISGRACEFUL as that coalition is."