

PUBLISHED BY GALE & SEATON. THURSDAY MORNING, JULY 18, 1836.

MONDAY, JULY 18, 1836.

FROM THE SOUTH.

We learn that Major General Scott and his staff returned to Columbus, in Georgia, on the 5th instant...

From Fort Mitchell, on the Saturday preceding, the contractors for the removal of the Creeks had started sixteen hundred Indians, men, women, and children, for Arkansas.

The following additional particulars are taken from the Georgia Courier:

AUGUSTA, JULY 11.

The Indians who committed the murders in Baker county, have been overtaken by Colonel BEALE, in the Chickasawatchee swamp, in that county, eight or ten killed, and twenty or thirty wounded.

General Scott has established two military posts on the stage road to Montgomery, one at Caswell's or McClellan, fifteen miles east of Tuskegee...

The Star of Monday remarks that Mr. J. Q. Adams, the Ex-President, in the House of Representatives, though never at a loss for words...

True, to the letter.—Nat. Intell.

FROM THE NATIONAL GAZETTE, JULY 15.

There is undoubtedly more meant than meets the eye in the late Treasury Circular. That even certificates of deposit from solvent and pet banks are to be refused, proves that some change, some overturning of the currency, is in contemplation—a war upon the long-established order of things...

We are satisfied, from the information which has already reached us, that the number of Killed and Wounded, from want of care or want of skill in firing salutes on the late anniversary of Independence, has not been less than fifty.

A man was killed at Elizabeth, in Harrison county (Ohio) by the accidental discharge of a cannon, while celebrating the 4th July.

LATEST FROM TEXAS.

FROM THE NEW ORLEANS PRESS, JULY 2.

FROM TEXAS.—By the steamer Caspian, arrived last night, we learn that information was received at Natchitoches on the 27th ult. that a division of the Mexican army of 7,000 men have marched into Texas...

FROM THE NEW ORLEANS ADVERTISER, JULY 2.

TEXAS.—Capt. Reid, of the steamer Caspian, from Natchitoches, arrived last evening, informs us that there was concentrated at the present time, in the very centre of Texas, not less than 7,000 Mexican troops...

DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

THURSDAY, MAY 19.

The consideration of the report made by Mr. PINECKNEY, from the select committee on the subject of the abolition of slavery, being under consideration.

The immediate question pending was the motion of Mr. ROBERTSON to recommit the report to the same committee, with instructions to report a resolution, that Congress has no constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia...

Mr. BYNUM, who was entitled to the floor, spoke at considerable length. He observed, that it had been said by certain gentlemen that they were disappointed in the report...

Mr. ROBERTSON, who was entitled to the floor, spoke at considerable length. He observed, that it had been said by certain gentlemen that they were disappointed in the report...

Mr. BYNUM, who was entitled to the floor, spoke at considerable length. He observed, that it had been said by certain gentlemen that they were disappointed in the report...

Mr. ROBERTSON explained. He said that they had surrendered every thing which the abolitionists expected. Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman. He did not, however, know what the abolitionists expected...

Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman. He did not, however, know what the abolitionists expected...

Mr. ROBERTSON explained. He said that they had surrendered every thing which the abolitionists expected. Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman...

Mr. BYNUM made some remarks upon misrepresentations made of the course of himself and other gentlemen by letter-writers from Washington, one of whom he designated as an abolitionist, &c.

Mr. PINECKNEY, in reply to this call upon him, declined giving any explanations. He could not do so, consistently with a sense of propriety, upon the call of an individual member of the House...

Mr. P. said he deeply regretted that inflammatory discussion had again arisen upon this matter. He should do nothing to continue it. He had always deprecated the agitation of slavery in the halls of Congress.

Mr. PINECKNEY then said, if that was his object, and a vote should be taken, he should certainly vote for the amendment. Mr. P. said he had always held the view...

Mr. BYNUM, who was entitled to the floor, spoke at considerable length. He observed, that it had been said by certain gentlemen that they were disappointed in the report...

Mr. ROBERTSON explained. He said that they had surrendered every thing which the abolitionists expected. Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman...

Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman. He did not, however, know what the abolitionists expected. Mr. ROBERTSON explained...

Mr. ROBERTSON explained. He said that they had surrendered every thing which the abolitionists expected. Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman...

Mr. BYNUM made some remarks upon misrepresentations made of the course of himself and other gentlemen by letter-writers from Washington, one of whom he designated as an abolitionist, &c.

Mr. PINECKNEY, in reply to this call upon him, declined giving any explanations. He could not do so, consistently with a sense of propriety, upon the call of an individual member of the House...

Mr. ROBERTSON rose in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina and South Carolina, and in support of his motion.

He said he ought, perhaps, to feel much honored by the suggestion of an opposition to a resolution of the Democratic party as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BYNUM). That gentleman, Mr. Speaker, seems greatly at a loss to comprehend my reasons for submitting the resolution now under consideration...

Mr. BYNUM, who was entitled to the floor, spoke at considerable length. He observed, that it had been said by certain gentlemen that they were disappointed in the report...

Mr. ROBERTSON explained. He said that they had surrendered every thing which the abolitionists expected. Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman...

Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman. He did not, however, know what the abolitionists expected. Mr. ROBERTSON explained...

Mr. ROBERTSON explained. He said that they had surrendered every thing which the abolitionists expected. Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman...

Mr. BYNUM made some remarks upon misrepresentations made of the course of himself and other gentlemen by letter-writers from Washington, one of whom he designated as an abolitionist, &c.

Mr. PINECKNEY, in reply to this call upon him, declined giving any explanations. He could not do so, consistently with a sense of propriety, upon the call of an individual member of the House...

constitutionality of the proposed interference. In a letter, to which his name is affixed, addressed to the electors of the Charleston electoral district, (South Carolina,) he uses this language, &c.

Mr. BYNUM, who was entitled to the floor, spoke at considerable length. He observed, that it had been said by certain gentlemen that they were disappointed in the report...

Mr. ROBERTSON explained. He said that they had surrendered every thing which the abolitionists expected. Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman...

Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman. He did not, however, know what the abolitionists expected. Mr. ROBERTSON explained...

Mr. ROBERTSON explained. He said that they had surrendered every thing which the abolitionists expected. Mr. BYNUM was glad he had misunderstood the gentleman...

Mr. BYNUM made some remarks upon misrepresentations made of the course of himself and other gentlemen by letter-writers from Washington, one of whom he designated as an abolitionist, &c.

Mr. PINECKNEY, in reply to this call upon him, declined giving any explanations. He could not do so, consistently with a sense of propriety, upon the call of an individual member of the House...

Mr. BYNUM made some remarks upon misrepresentations made of the course of himself and other gentlemen by letter-writers from Washington, one of whom he designated as an abolitionist, &c.

men, why press the constitutional question now? I reply, we press it to our safety, to our safety, to our safety. We are pressed by every other form in which this question has been presented...

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not suspect my colleague of any intention to abandon it; nor will I believe there is one of them who has maintained it that can be seduced or driven from it. They are prepared, I trust, to meet all the consequences...

TUESDAY, MAY 24.

Mr. ROBERTSON continued. Mr. Speaker: I have said more than I had intended on the preliminary ground, justifying the submission of the resolution now under discussion. I come now directly to the question involved in it.

In examining that question I shall enter into no discussion of what the venerable member from Massachusetts (Mr. ADAMS) tauntingly terms the sublime merits of slavery. Which, however, sir, permit me to say, whatever they may be, are not perhaps greatly to be envied.

In discussing it, from all that has been said, it is my fate, I fear, to address an unwilling audience—one, perhaps, that has already prejudged the question. A very general impression, none can doubt, exists among our fellow-citizens...

Look, sir, to the Constitution of New Hampshire. The clause which may be regarded as bearing upon this point, is a part of the 12th section of the Bill of Rights. It is in these words: Every member of the community has a right to be protected by it in the enjoyment of his life, liberty, and property...

Connecticut, like Rhode Island, remained during our revolutionary struggle, under the regulations of a charter granted by Charles II. She never formed a constitution till the year 1818. By a provision of her Bill of Rights, adopted in 1784, sec. 2, it was declared that "no man's goods should be taken unless lawfully acquired by law."





