

MR. CLAY'S GREAT SPEECH.

It would be our desire to lay before our readers... the great speech of Mr. CLAY, in the Senate, on Tuesday week, Feb. 5th, upon the Compromise Resolutions introduced by him on the subject of Slavery.

Sir, what significance do we not pass through in this short career of ours? Eight years, or nearly eight years ago, I took my leave, finally, and as I supposed, forever from this body.

Mr. President, it is passion, passion—party, party, and interposition—that is all in view in the adjustment of the great questions which unhappily at this time divide our distracted country.

Mr. President, the next resolution in the series which I have offered I beg gentlemen candidly now to look at. I was aware, perfectly aware of the perseverance with which the Wilmot proviso was insisted upon.

Why, these United States consist of thirty States. In fifteen of them there was slavery, in fifteen of them slavery did not exist. Well, how can it be argued that the fifteen slave States, by the operation of the Constitution of the United States, carried into the ceded territories their institution of slavery.

What are these? Well, sir, what is it that is offered there? It is a declaration of what I characterize, and must still characterize, with great deference to all those who entertain opposite opinions, two truths. I will not say incontestable, but so clear, that I think they ought to be regarded as indisputable truths.

Sir, before I approach that subject, allow me to say that, in my humble judgment, the institution of slavery presents two questions totally distinct, and resting on entirely different grounds—slavery within the States, and slavery without the States.

Now, with respect to the opinion here expressed that slavery does not exist in the Territories ceded to the United States by Mexico, I can only refer to the fact of the passage of the law by the Supreme Government of Mexico abolishing it, I think in 1824, and to the subsequent passage of a law by the legislative body of Mexico, I forget in what year, by which the proposed... what I believe to have been carried into full effect.

There is, however, in this resolution—by either party to the other? I know that gentlemen who come from slaveholding States say the North gets all the land acres, but by whom does it get it? Does it get it by any action of Congress? If slavery be introduced within the limits of California, have I been done by Congress—by this Government? No, sir, that introduction is imposed by California herself. And has it not been the doctrine of all parties that when a State is about to be admitted into the Union, the State has a right to decide for itself whether it will or will not have slavery within its limits?

Here the confusion arising from the pressure of the crowd was so great that it was with difficulty Mr. C. could be heard. And he suspended his remarks until the lobby had been sufficiently cleared to secure a restoration of order.

Mr. Clay resumed. The great principle, sir, which was in contest upon the memorable occasion of the introduction of Missouri into the Union was, whether it was competent or not competent for Congress to impose any restriction which should exist after she became a member of the Union? We who were in favor of the admission of Missouri contended that no such restriction should be imposed.

Mr. President, the next resolution in the series which I have offered I beg gentlemen candidly now to look at. I was aware, perfectly aware of the perseverance with which the Wilmot proviso was insisted upon. I know that every one of the free States in this Union, without exception, had by its legislative body passed resolutions instructing their Senators and requesting their Representatives to get that restriction incorporated in any territorial government which might be established under the auspices of Congress.

Why, these United States consist of thirty States. In fifteen of them there was slavery, in fifteen of them slavery did not exist. Well, how can it be argued that the fifteen slave States, by the operation of the Constitution of the United States, carried into the ceded territories their institution of slavery, any more than it can be argued on the other side, that the fifteen free States, by the operation of the Constitution of the United States, carried into the ceded territories their principle of freedom which they from policy have chosen to adopt within their limits?

What are these? Well, sir, what is it that is offered there? It is a declaration of what I characterize, and must still characterize, with great deference to all those who entertain opposite opinions, two truths. I will not say incontestable, but so clear, that I think they ought to be regarded as indisputable truths.

Sir, before I approach that subject, allow me to say that, in my humble judgment, the institution of slavery presents two questions totally distinct, and resting on entirely different grounds—slavery within the States, and slavery without the States.

Now, with respect to the opinion here expressed that slavery does not exist in the Territories ceded to the United States by Mexico, I can only refer to the fact of the passage of the law by the Supreme Government of Mexico abolishing it, I think in 1824, and to the subsequent passage of a law by the legislative body of Mexico, I forget in what year, by which the proposed... what I believe to have been carried into full effect.

And then, if unfortunately civil war should break out, and should prevent the actions of the earth the spectacle of one portion of this Union endeavoring to subvert an institution in violation of the Constitution and the most sacred obligations which ever bind men; and should present the spectacle in which we should have the sympathies, the good wishes, and the desire for our success by all men who love justice and truth.

Mr. President, we have heard, all of us have read of the efforts of France to prohibit, what, on the continent of Europe? Not slavery, sir; not slavery, but the rights of man; and we know the fate of her efforts in a work of that kind.

Compromise was to be attained only in one way, and that was for the North to abstain from all encroachments on the South; to surrender fugitive slaves, and to leave the territories to regulate their own domestic policy.

Mr. Houston spoke in terms of deep feeling of the kindness shown to him by Benton, when he was an exile and friendless in the wilderness.

Mr. H. went on to express his views of the proposed Southern Convention, and condemned its policy. He hoped the contingency would never arise on which the Convention was to act.

Mr. Houston—The last thing I thought of. Mr. Butler asked a question. Did the gentleman intend to say that S. Carolina had originated the convention in Mississippi? This was not so.

Mr. H. went on to express his views of the proposed Southern Convention, and condemned its policy. He hoped the contingency would never arise on which the Convention was to act.

Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, declared that the people of Mississippi voted from the bidding of no man. She acted from the voice of the people, which was above his detection.

And then, if unfortunately civil war should break out, and should prevent the actions of the earth the spectacle of one portion of this Union endeavoring to subvert an institution in violation of the Constitution and the most sacred obligations which ever bind men.

Compromise was to be attained only in one way, and that was for the North to abstain from all encroachments on the South; to surrender fugitive slaves, and to leave the territories to regulate their own domestic policy.

Mr. H. went on to express his views of the proposed Southern Convention, and condemned its policy. He hoped the contingency would never arise on which the Convention was to act.

Mr. Houston spoke in terms of deep feeling of the kindness shown to him by Benton, when he was an exile and friendless in the wilderness.

Mr. H. went on to express his views of the proposed Southern Convention, and condemned its policy. He hoped the contingency would never arise on which the Convention was to act.

Mr. Houston—The last thing I thought of. Mr. Butler asked a question. Did the gentleman intend to say that S. Carolina had originated the convention in Mississippi? This was not so.

Mr. H. went on to express his views of the proposed Southern Convention, and condemned its policy. He hoped the contingency would never arise on which the Convention was to act.

Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, declared that the people of Mississippi voted from the bidding of no man. She acted from the voice of the people, which was above his detection.

direction of any one, he is mistaken. No one representing that State recognizes any one as a leader. I recognize no leader on the face of the globe.

Mr. Butler—it is due to history to state that the people of Mississippi probably acted upon the Southern address, and I here state that the Southern address did not originate with any Senator or member from S. Carolina.

Mr. Houston said the Southern Convention was proposed in 1835, by the writer signing himself "Crisis," in the Charleston Mercury.

Connected as the Union is with the remembrance of past happiness, a sense of present blessings, and the hope of future peace and prosperity, every dictate of wisdom, every feeling of duty, every emotion of patriotism, tend to inspire fidelity and devotion to it, and admonish us cautiously to avoid any unnecessary controversy which can either endanger it or impair its strength.

Internal Improvement Association. The members of the Raleigh Association are requested to meet at the Court House, at 11 o'clock, A. M. on Tuesday next, for the purpose of making arrangements for the Association to be properly represented in the Hillsboro Convention.

CADET OF TEMPERANCE. We have received a specimen No. of a semi-weekly sheet, proposed to be published under the above title, at Wakeboro, by Francis M. Paul.

MEETING AT OXFORD. We had the privilege of hearing the speech delivered by Gen. SAUNDERS at the Internal Improvement Meeting in Oxford, on Wednesday week.

Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, declared that the people of Mississippi voted from the bidding of no man. She acted from the voice of the people, which was above his detection.

of course, is more direct in the Raleigh and Gaston Road; and it is not natural that her people should reserve their full energies to expend upon that work—but then the reflection obtains that without the Central Road, their own must fail.

Speech of Henry Clay. This great man has once more lifted up his voice in the National Councils, in behalf of peace and Union.

Such a man is Henry Clay. He speaks his purposes out, calmly, boldly, manfully, and without concealment—and in the most pathetic and masterly language he asseverates his devotion to the Union which our fathers framed.

We believe the Raleigh Standard to be the most distinguished and unfair print with which we are acquainted; its course, in this respect, being dictated by a hand "willing to wound, but yet afraid to strike."

A MASKED BATTERY. We believe the Raleigh Standard to be the most distinguished and unfair print with which we are acquainted; its course, in this respect, being dictated by a hand "willing to wound, but yet afraid to strike."

Such is the "Organ" (God save the mark!) of the Democratic party.

MEETING AT OXFORD. We had the privilege of hearing the speech delivered by Gen. SAUNDERS at the Internal Improvement Meeting in Oxford, on Wednesday week.

Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, declared that the people of Mississippi voted from the bidding of no man. She acted from the voice of the people, which was above his detection.

