

Edgefield Advertiser.

"We will cling to the Pillars of the Temple of our Liberties, and if it must fall, we will Perish amidst the Ruins."

VOLUME XIII.

EDGEFIELD, S. C. AUGUST 23, 1843.

NO. 31.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY
BY WM. F. DURISOE.
EDITOR & PROPRIETOR.

NEW TERMS
Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, per annum if paid in advance—\$31 not paid within six months from the date of subscription, and \$4 if not paid before the expiration of the year. All subscriptions will be continued, unless otherwise ordered before the expiration of the year; but no paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the Publisher.

Any person procuring five responsible subscribers, shall receive the paper for one year, gratis.

Advertisements conspicuously inserted at 75 cents per square, (12 lines, or less,) for the first insertion, and \$74 for each continuance. Those published monthly or quarterly, will be charged \$1 per square. Advertisements not having the number of insertions marked on them, will be continued until ordered out and charged accordingly.

Communications, post paid, will be promptly and strictly attended to.

The following gentlemen are announced by their friends as candidates for the Office of Tax Collector, at the ensuing election:

Col. JOHN QUATTLEBUM,
GEORGE J. SHEPPARD,
EDMUND MORRIS,
SAMSON B. MAYES,
Maj. S. C. SCOTT,
LEVI R. WILSON,
JAMES SPANN.

WE are authorized to announce DANIEL HOLLAND, Esq., as a candidate for reelection to a seat in the House of Delegates.

WE are authorized to announce B. C. YANCEY, Esq., as a candidate for a seat in the House of Representatives, at the ensuing election.

March 29 to 10

The friends of Col. R. B. BOURNIGHT, announce him as a Candidate for a seat in the House of Representatives, at the ensuing election.

WE are authorized to announce W. A. HARRIS, Esq., as a candidate for a seat in the House of Representatives, at the next election.

February 3 to 3

The friends of Maj. JOHN TOMKINS announce him as a candidate for a seat in the House of Representatives at the ensuing election.

May 3

The friends of Dr. JOHN LAKE, announce him as a Candidate for a seat in the House of Representatives, at the ensuing election.

March 13 to 5

The friends of Maj. ABRAHAM JONES announce him as a candidate for re-election to the Legislature.

The friends of PETER QUATTLEBUM, Esq., announce him as a candidate for the Office of Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, of this District, at the ensuing election.

January 14 to 50

The friends of WESLEY BODIE, Esq., announce him as a candidate for the Office of Sheriff of this District, at the ensuing election.

January 14 to 51

The friends of HENRY T. WRIGHT, Esq., announce him as a candidate for the office of Ordinary of this District, at the ensuing election.

may 24 to 18

Notice.
The Estate of Marshal R. Smith, deceased, being without administration, and therefore derelict, all persons having papers pertaining to the estate, are requested to hand them over to me by the earliest practicable time, and all those indebted to the estate to make payment, and those having demands to present them properly attested.

JOHN HILL, O. E. D.
June 14 to 21

Hamburg Journal will please copy.

Notice.
All those indebted to the estate of Charity Johnson, dec'd., are requested to make immediate payment, and those having demands to present them properly attested.

C. B. GOULDEN,
SIMEON ATTAWAY,
Administrators.
July 7 to 24

Administrator's Notice.
All persons indebted to the estate of B. M. Rodgers, deceased, are requested to make immediate payment, and those having demands to present them properly attested.

JAS. G. O. WILKINSON, Adm'r.
may 31 to 19

The Hamburg Journal is requested to copy the above three months.

Notice.
I hereby given, that the next Legislature will be petitioned, praying the opening of a Public Road, near J. G. Burnett's, to run by J. W. and R. Cooper's residence, into the Island Ford Road, near T. C. Griffin's thence across it by James Cresswell's residence, on through N. L. Griffin's plantation, into the old Charleston Road, near his quarter.

Correspondence of the Charleston Courier.

WASHINGTON, August 9.
The Senate have not yet voted upon the project, which they still have before them, for the purchase of the territorial and possessory rights of the Hudson's Bay and Pajel's Sound Company, on our Oregon borders.

By this session, the United States will acquire the whole territory which was in dispute between us and Great Britain, with that of the Columbia river. We will forever settle, by this means, all territorial questions with Great Britain, and it is well known that the Ashburton treaty left to us an inheritance of difficulty in regard to that boundary.

The Hudson Bay Company and the British Government, which has always supported and maintained that Company, make the proposition from no fear of the future hostility of the United States.

We, who are descendants of the English men know and feel that no such motive could influence either party, either in the offer or the acceptance. But it is apprehended that, in 1803, a difficulty will arise as to the construction of the clause giving to the British Company the right of navigating the Columbia, and certain other rights. The charter of the Company being perpetual instead of being limited to 1868.

The proposition is before the Senate in secret session. Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Webster and others of the members of both houses are known to be in favor of it.

The resolution before the Senate advises and recommends the purchase. It may be too late, at this session to effect the object.

August 10th 1843.

The Senate have been engaged during the whole day on the Oregon Bill from the House, and the various amendments thereto. The Committee on Territories had moved an amendment to the bill which recognizes the Missouri Compromise, leaving a provision in the bill, extending the Ordinance of 1787 over the territory.

There was some doubt whether the amendment of the Committee distinctly adopted the Missouri Compromise as to the whole of the new territories; but Douglass made the matter clear, as an amendment to the Missouri Compromise. It was adopted by the friends of the measure.

amendments would destroy Congress, the Missouri Compromise rejected. It was ruled out of session. It was thought that the Missouri Compromise on the line of 36° 30' would be, in fact, to secure the loss of the bill; others, however, thought that the House would concur in it.

From the tone of the debates this morning no one could have imagined the possibility that the Missouri Compromise Bill would be agreed to. The Committee on Territories had not ventured to propose it, except in a very indistinct way.

Mr. Webster was the first to rise and oppose all compromises by which slave representation should be increased. He did not pretend, he said, to speak for the North, but every one who had known his course, would allow him the credit of consistency, for he had foreseen this danger, and had resisted the acquisition of a new territory—Texas, California and New Mexico—he had opposed the Mexican war and the Mexican peace and all extension of slavery.

Mr. Butler made a very eloquent harangue on the subject, evidently considering that all chance for compromise was out of the question, and called upon the South to stand to their arms. Mr. Hale declared that the North would never recede from their position against the extension of slavery. Mr. Niles threw the responsibility of the issue thus made upon the South—which, he said, had demanded the extension of slavery over the Continent.

Mr. Calhoun's speech was made under the most solemn and gloomy impressions as to the result. He was willing, on the part of the South, to acquiesce in a compromise on the Missouri line, if tendered by the other party—the stronger section of the Union. But, after the failure of the Missouri Compromise based on the Constitution, he had no hope of the adjustment of the question by Congress. The manner in which the evil had grown to its present magnitude, he exhibited in a vivid manner. It was a disease which, if left to run its course, must terminate fatally. It must be arrested, and the South must take the matter into her own hands. If not arrested, it must terminate in dissolution, or in the destruction of our institutions—one or both—and in both more probably than in one.

Mr. Reverdy Johnson declared that if the North persisted in their pretensions to exclude slavery from all the new territories, the days of the Union were numbered.

After these and many speeches of a very decided character, the question was mooted whether it would yet be better to try the Missouri Compromise as an amendment to the bill, and, in the words of the compromise, so as to remove all doubt.

The project was tried, and it was carried by a vote of 33 to 21—Mr. Calhoun voting for it, but stating that for reasons given by him heretofore, he would vote against the bill, but he will acquiesce in the compromise when made. The Bill, as amended, was passed.

August 10.

Seldom has there been witnessed in the Senate a more exciting and important discussion than that which has just terminated. The subject was the bill from the

House establishing a territorial government for Oregon, and the question was on an amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Territories, to insert after the prohibition of slavery in the bill the words "inasmuch as said territory lies north of 36° 30' north latitude." It was most gratifying to witness the ability and unanimity with which the rights and honor of the South were maintained by Southern Senators, Whig and Democrat. Calhoun and Berrien, Butler and Johnson, of Md., Mangum and King, and Johnson, of Ga., and Hunter and Mason, stood shoulder to shoulder in resistance to the assaults of Webster, Davis, Hale, Niles, and Walker; while Douglas, of Illinois, deserves all honor and credit for his patriotic and manly movement with a view to harmonize the dissentions in Congress and restore peace to the Union.

Mr. Webster (whose absence from the Senate during the debate on the Compromise Bill has been the subject of so much comment) took this opportunity of declaring his unalterable determination never to consent to the addition of another inch of slave territory to the Union, or to any accession to the slave power in Congress. He was opposed to all concessions and compromises, and would vote against the bill if the proposed amendment was adopted.

Mr. Butler, of your State, made an eloquent and forcible reply to Mr. Webster, and expressed his determination to advise the people of his State to defend their rights to an equal participation in the territories of the Union at all and every hazard, and to resist any invasion of them even to the death if necessary. He called upon Northern men to settle this question now on fair and equitable terms, as the only means of avoiding results most disastrous to the Union.

Mr. Hale, the Abolitionist, followed in some sneering remarks upon the moderation of South Carolina and in opposition to the amendment.

The vote was about to be taken, when Mr. Calhoun arose, an able and impressive speech, during which he reviewed the origin and progress of the Abolitionary

the South either to unconditional submission or to such measure.

He professed a strong attachment for the Union, and said that the South had done much and suffered much for its perpetuation, but there is a limit beyond which she could not pass. It could not be expected that the Southern States would consent to remain in the Union except as the equals of their Northern Confederates. He referred to the efforts of Abolitionists in other countries, and their results in St. Domingo and other British West India Islands. The products of slave labor in the Southern States had enriched the North, gave employment to a large portion of Europe, and furnished the most important element of the commerce of the world. Its evils, if any were attendant upon the institution, fell only upon the South, and so long as she was content to bear them it was impertinent and presumptuous in the North to interfere.

He declared his opposition to the amendment as ambiguous and delusive. He was for fair dealing, and wished the North to state explicitly and without reserve its purposes, so that the South might understand them and act accordingly.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. Douglas incorporating the Missouri Compromise into the bill, and it was carried—ayes 32, nays 21, as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Borland, Bright, Butler, Cameron, Davis, of Mississippi, Dickinson, Douglas, Downs, Fitzgerald, Foote, Haneau, Houston, Hunter, Johnson, of Maryland, Johnson, of Louisiana, Johnson, of Georgia, King, Lewis, Mangum, Mason, Metcalfe, Pearce, Sebastian, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney and Underwood—32.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Atherton, Baldwin, Bradbury, Breese, Clarke, Corwin, Davis, of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dix, Dodge, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Niles, Phelps, Upham, Walker and Webster—21.

You will perceive that every friend of Gen. Taylor from the non-Slaveholding States voted against this amendment; while seven Democratic Senators from the Free States voted in its favor. The South, Whig and Democrat, was unanimously in the affirmative, with the exception of Mr. Calhoun and Messrs. Yulee and Westcott, who, while they declined to vote for it, expressed their willingness to acquiesce in its adoption.

The bill, as amended, was then passed by a majority of nine, and sent to the House for concurrence, and at 10 o'clock the Senate adjourned.

From the Charleston Mercury, Aug. 11th.

THE OREGON BILL.

An effort has been made to make something of the vote in the Senate on Mr. Hale's proposition to engraft the Wilmot Proviso on the Oregon bill. It is said that on this motion an actual majority of

those who voted to insert it in the bill were Democrats. Hence the inference that the Democrats are no better than the Whigs in the North and the West on the subject of slavery. Now, admit the facts and the inference to be true, how do they justify the conclusion that we ought to go with the Whigs in support of Gen. Taylor? If the slavery question is to be the exclusive question in the next Presidential election, then these facts will only show that we ought to go with neither the Whigs nor the Democrats. We ought to put forth some candidate of our own, truly reflecting our principles, and look to our own safety, independent of either of the two great parties in the Union. But the facts justify no such inference. The following is the vote referred to:

Yeas—Allen, Atherton, Baldwin, Benton, Bradbury, Clarke, Corwin, Davis, of Mass., Dayton, Dix, Dodge, Felch, Fitzgerald, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Niles, Spruance, Upham, and Walker—21.

Nays—Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Borland, Breese, Bright, Butler, Calhoun, Clayton, Davis, of Miss., Dickinson, Douglas, Downs, Foote, Haneau, Houston, Hunter, Johnson, of Md., Johnson, of La., Johnson, of Ga., King, Lewis, Mangum, Mason, Metcalfe, Rusk, Sebastian, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Westcott, and Yulee—33.

[Mr. Phelps absent. Messrs. Cameron, Pearce and Webster absent.]

Now, in order to understand the true nature of the vote from the Free States, it is not enough to inquire who of the Whigs or the Democrats voted for the Wilmot Proviso but we must know also who voted against it. The following Democrats from the Free States voted against it: Breese, Bright, Dickinson, Douglas, Haneau, and Sturgeon. Now how many Whigs from the Free States voted with them. Not one! Here, then, are six Democrats from the Free States voting with the Southern Senators against the motion to add the Wilmot Proviso to the Oregon bill. Does this prove that the Democrats from the Free States

From the Charleston Mercury, August 5th.

We commend to our readers, and especially that portion of them who have been seduced into the Taylor movement, the communication in our columns to-day signed "State Rights." As a further commentary on the views with which our correspondents closes, we submit the following synopsis of the vote in the House of Representatives on the Territorial Bill.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, a Whig, moved to lay the bill on the table; the vote stood thus:

Non-Slaveholding States, North and East.

Yeas.	Nays.
4 Democrats	2 Democrats
1 Whig	
NEW HAMPSHIRE.	
1 Democrat	
1 Whig	
MASSACHUSETTS.	
9 Whigs	
RHODE ISLAND.	
1 Whig	
1 Democrat	
CONNECTICUT.	
4 Whigs	
VERMONT.	
3 Whigs	
1 Democrat	
NEW YORK.	
21 Whigs	1 Democrat
8 Democrats	
NEW JERSEY.	
4 Whigs	
PENNSYLVANIA.	
14 Whigs	3 Democrats
4 Democrats	
Slaveholding States.	
DELAWARE.	
	1 Whig
MARYLAND.	
1 Whig	2 Whigs
	2 Democrats
VIRGINIA.	
1 Whig	5 Whigs
	9 Democrats
NORTH CAROLINA.	
1 Whig	4 Whigs
	3 Democrats
SOUTH CAROLINA.	
	7 Democrats
GEORGIA.	
1 Whig	3 Whigs
	4 Democrats

STATISTICS OF THE MEXICAN WAR.

The New Orleans Bulletin is summing up the losses in the Mexican war, by death in the battle field and by disease.

The former bear but a small proportion to the latter. The soldier in Mexico had much less danger to encounter from the bullets of the foe than from the inhospitable climate. The whole number of Americans killed in the war, including the line of the Rio Grande and that of Vera Cruz, is estimated at 2000 and the wounded at 4000. It is impossible to say how many of the latter have died in consequence of their wounds, but we should suppose not less than one fourth, say 1000, making in all 3000 deaths from battle.

The ravages of disease were terrible. At Perote there are 2600 American graves, all victims of disease. At the City of Mexico the deaths were, for the greater part of the time, 1000 monthly.

The first Mississippi Regiment that went out to the Rio Grande, buried 135 on the banks of that river before it ever went into battle, and finally brought back less than one third of their number. They suffered dreadfully at Buena Vista.

The first and second Pennsylvania Regiments recently returned, went out 1800 strong, (900 each,) they brought home about 600 of their original number. About 220 fell in battle, nearly 400 died, and 600 were discharged as unfit for duty. How many of the latter have since died is of course unknown.

STATISTICS OF THE MEXICAN WAR.

The New Orleans Bulletin is summing up the losses in the Mexican war, by death in the battle field and by disease.

The former bear but a small proportion to the latter. The soldier in Mexico had much less danger to encounter from the bullets of the foe than from the inhospitable climate. The whole number of Americans killed in the war, including the line of the Rio Grande and that of Vera Cruz, is estimated at 2000 and the wounded at 4000. It is impossible to say how many of the latter have died in consequence of their wounds, but we should suppose not less than one fourth, say 1000, making in all 3000 deaths from battle.

The ravages of disease were terrible. At Perote there are 2600 American graves, all victims of disease. At the City of Mexico the deaths were, for the greater part of the time, 1000 monthly.

The first Mississippi Regiment that went out to the Rio Grande, buried 135 on the banks of that river before it ever went into battle, and finally brought back less than one third of their number. They suffered dreadfully at Buena Vista.

The first and second Pennsylvania Regiments recently returned, went out 1800 strong, (900 each,) they brought home about 600 of their original number. About 220 fell in battle, nearly 400 died, and 600 were discharged as unfit for duty. How many of the latter have since died is of course unknown.

STATISTICS OF THE MEXICAN WAR.

The New Orleans Bulletin is summing up the losses in the Mexican war, by death in the battle field and by disease.

The former bear but a small proportion to the latter. The soldier in Mexico had much less danger to encounter from the bullets of the foe than from the inhospitable climate. The whole number of Americans killed in the war, including the line of the Rio Grande and that of Vera Cruz, is estimated at 2000 and the wounded at 4000. It is impossible to say how many of the latter have died in consequence of their wounds, but we should suppose not less than one fourth, say 1000, making in all 3000 deaths from battle.

The ravages of disease were terrible. At Perote there are 2600 American graves, all victims of disease. At the City of Mexico the deaths were, for the greater part of the time, 1000 monthly.

The first Mississippi Regiment that went out to the Rio Grande, buried 135 on the banks of that river before it ever went into battle, and finally brought back less than one third of their number. They suffered dreadfully at Buena Vista.

The first and second Pennsylvania Regiments recently returned, went out 1800 strong, (900 each,) they brought home about 600 of their original number. About 220 fell in battle, nearly 400 died, and 600 were discharged as unfit for duty. How many of the latter have since died is of course unknown.

The third and fourth Tennessee Regiments, also recently returned, lost 300 by death. Neither of these regiments have been in action.

Capt. Naylor, of Pennsylvania, took down a company of one hundred and four men, he brought back seventeen; he entered the battle of Contreras with 33 men; he brought 19 out of it.

The most frightful instance of morality, however, that we have heard of, was in that gallant corps, the Georgia Battalion; commanded by a gallant and accomplished officer, Colonel Seymour.

They were considered acclimated, and actually suffered much less whilst in the lower country, than when marched into the interior, on the high land. The battalion went to Mexico 419 strong; about 220 actually died; a large number were discharged with broken down and ruined constitutions; and many of them, no doubt have since gone to their graves; and the battalion was reduced to thirty four men fit for duty!! On one parade, when a certain company was called; that had mustered upwards of 100 men, a single private answered to the call, and was his sole living representative. The Captain, the three Lieutenants, the four Sergeants, and the four Corporals, (every commissioned and non commissioned officer) were dead!

We have heard from officers of many other regiments details very similar to those we have given above, which may be taken as about the fair average losses of all the volunteer regiments. The regulars did not suffer to the same extent.

Mr. Greeley, of the New York Tribune, in his paper of the 31st July, thus briefly retracts his fundamental objections to the nomination of General Taylor:

1. He is a Military Chieftain, whose whole mature life has been passed in the Army, necessarily diverted his mind to a great degree from civil affairs. We dislike the principles of choosing our civil rulers merely or mainly because of the distinction they have achieved in military service.

2. He is a Military Chieftain, whose whole mature life has been passed in the Army, necessarily diverted his mind to a great degree from civil affairs. We dislike the principles of choosing our civil rulers merely or mainly because of the distinction they have achieved in military service.

3. He is a Military Chieftain, whose whole mature life has been passed in the Army, necessarily diverted his mind to a great degree from civil affairs. We dislike the principles of choosing our civil rulers merely or mainly because of the distinction they have achieved in military service.

4. Gen. Taylor stood before the public in an equivocal attitude with regard to the Whig party. He was supported by some as independent of party; by others as 'a Whig but not an ultra Whig,' and again by others as 'a full Whig and a quarter over.' He was pledged to some to run for President, even in opposition to the Whig nominee; by others he was understood and represented as committed to abide the decision of the Philadelphia Convention.

It seems difficult to see how a frank, honest, straightforward man should get involved in such labyrinthine of misapprehension.

5. He is first proposed and most warmly urged for the Presidency, in good part by men in whose integrity we had no confidence and whose characters we could not esteem—who had belonged to several parties and acquired no good reputation with any—men whom we had been compelled to regard as speculators in politics and mercenary hunters after spoils.

6. He was an especial favorite with those known to us as Northern Whigs with Southern principles, advocates of a 'vigorous prosecution of the War,' 'no peace without indemnity,' 'our country right or wrong,' &c. This class do not like the Tribune, nor we them.

7. Last and worst of all, he was the candidate of the ultra Slaveholding interest, so far as any portion of it adheres to the Whig party—of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Florida, and Texas—of those who claim for the South the right of planting Slavery in the new Territories. We do say, however, that he was the only one among all those proposed as Whig candidates for the Presidency who had never uttered a word in public reprehension of Slavery and was not known to us to be hostile to its extension.

These are the reasons which induced us, in opposition to our uniform course hitherto, to hesitate as to supporting the regular Whig nominations, so far as the President was concerned. To us they seemed strong enough to require hesitation at least. Yet we said at the first, and have stood to it ever since, that if compelled to choose between the support of Taylor and the election of Cass, we should support Taylor.

We have doubts as to Taylor's fitness for the Presidency. Gen. C. lacks the good traits in Gen. Taylor's character which we have cheerfully recognized and acknowledged; he is disqualified for the Presidency alike by what he has done and what he has failed to do. Even on the Slavery question, where he has naturally the better position by fifteen degrees of latitude.

STATISTICS OF THE MEXICAN WAR.

The New Orleans Bulletin is summing up the losses in the Mexican war, by death in the battle field and by disease.

The former bear but a small proportion to the latter. The soldier in Mexico had much less danger to encounter from the bullets of the foe than from the inhospitable climate. The whole number of Americans killed in the war, including the line of the Rio Grande and that of Vera Cruz, is estimated at 2000 and the wounded at 4000. It is impossible to say how many of the latter have died in consequence of their wounds, but we should suppose not less than one fourth, say 1000, making in all 3000 deaths from battle.

The ravages of disease were terrible. At Perote there are 2600 American graves, all victims of disease. At the City of Mexico the deaths were, for the greater part of the time, 1000 monthly.

The first Mississippi Regiment that went out to the Rio Grande, buried 135 on the banks of that river before it ever went into battle, and finally brought back less than one third of their number. They suffered dreadfully at Buena Vista.

The first and second Pennsylvania Regiments recently returned, went out 1800 strong, (900 each,) they brought home about 600 of their original number. About 220 fell in battle, nearly 400 died, and 600 were discharged as unfit for duty. How many of the latter have since died is of course unknown.

STATISTICS OF THE MEXICAN WAR.

The New Orleans Bulletin is summing up the losses in the Mexican war, by death in the battle field and by disease.

The former bear but a small proportion to the latter. The soldier in Mexico had much less danger to encounter from the bullets of the foe than from the inhospitable climate. The whole number of Americans killed in the war, including the line of the Rio Grande and that of Vera Cruz, is estimated at 2000 and the wounded at 4000. It is impossible to say how many of the latter have died in consequence of their wounds, but we should suppose not less than one fourth, say 1000, making in all 3000 deaths from battle.

The ravages of disease were terrible. At Perote there are 2600 American graves, all victims of disease. At the City of Mexico the deaths were, for the greater part of the time, 1000 monthly.

The first Mississippi Regiment that went out to the Rio Grande, buried 135 on the banks of that river before it ever went into battle, and finally brought back less than one third of their number. They suffered dreadfully at Buena Vista.

The first and second Pennsylvania Regiments recently returned, went out 1800 strong, (900 each,) they brought home about 600 of their original number. About 220 fell in battle, nearly 400 died, and 600 were discharged as unfit for duty. How many of the latter have since died is of course unknown.