Terms of the Watchman.

For Subscription, per year, Two Dollars—payable in advance. But if not paid in advance, Two dollars and fifty cts. will be charged.

Advertisements inserted at $1. for the first, and 25 cts. for each subsequent insertion. Court orders charged 25 per ct. higher than these rates. A liberal deduction to those who advertise by the year.

Letters to the Editors must be post paid.

ON PAINTING HOUSES.

BY ROBERT R. HARDEN.

Sir:—We use paint on our wooden buildings with two objects: first, ornament; second, durability. Was oil used by itself without any coloring matter, the wood would be made more durable than it is with paint: but as ornament is a considerable part of the objects of painting, and as the addition of paint to the oil, when properly prepared, does not very materially injure the preservative qualities of the oil, the ornamental effect of the coloring more than counterbalances the injury it does. Paint when properly prepared, therefore while it is highly ornamental to wooden buildings, so materially contributes towards their durability, that there is economy in using it. But as it is generally prepared. (I may say always.) the ornamental effect of it on the outside of buildings is made only temporary, and its preservative qualities wholly destroyed. It is only necessary to look at our quickly decaying wooden buildings, with the paint washed off more or less in different places, according as it is exposed to the sun and rain, to be satisfied that the expense of painting has added very little towards preserving the building; and whether a building looks better without paint, or with paint nearly all washed off, with here and there a little remaining to show that it was painted, taste must determine. If what I have stated be a fact, that paint as mostly prepared, is of little value, it will be well to look into the cause of it that the evil may be removed; and if I give the correct cause, happily the evil is removed without expense *or trouble*: or rather it is cheaper to paint well than in this defective manner. We have only to leave out the spirits of turpentine, and we will have good paint. Ask the painter why he adds it to the paint and he will tell you to make it dry quick. This is just the same as saying, to destroy the oil which renders the paint useless. Now let us reason upon it and see if this is correct. If we pour oil on wood it soaks into it, and after it is all soaked up, if we apply more oil it will strike still deeper and soak up more; when it has penetrated sufficiently deep into the wood as to prevent moisture from rain, &c., penetrating as deep as itself, the wood is rendered very lasting. This would be the case if the building was simply covered with two coats of oil without paint. If we give it only one coat of oil, with a sufficient quantity of paint to give it color, the wood would so quickly soak up the oil that the paint would be left a dry powder on the building, that would be easily rubbed or washed off. If we give it first a coat of oil with a little paint added to it, the oil soaks into the pores, another coat of oil with the proper quantity of paint, while the pores are filled with the recently put on, or first coat, remains sufficiently long before the oil is soaked up by the pores, for a part of it to dry with the paint which forms a permanent covering of paint.—This is the advantage of giving two coats of paint; if the first coat was oil only, it would be better. When a house is thus painted, all the injury done by the paint, is the oil which it retains and prevents from soaking into the wood, and this is in part, perhaps wholly, counterbalanced in forming a firm external covering which tends to exclude moisture; thus painted a building is preserved and ornamented.—Now what will be the effect of adding spirits of turpentine to the oil? We know of nothing better calculated to destroy our intentions in the use of both the oil and paint than the addition of turpentine to the oil. Every housekeeper knows that if oil is on her floor, spirits of turpentine is the application to remove it. Every wash woman knows that if oil is on her clothes turpentine is the application to remove it; and how does it remove it when the oil and turpentine are added together? A chemical union takes place, and the qualities of both are destroyed, and although either the oil or turpentine by themselves when applied on wood would add to its durability, yet when added together the original qualities of both are destroyed and the application is useless, just as an acid and alkali, when mixed together, destroy the qualities of each other and the effect of neither remains. Now when a building is painted with two coats of paint to which spirits of turpentine is added, instead of the first covering of oil, (which has very little paint,) being soaked up, and the second covering, as the pores are already fed, soaking up the oil so slow that a part of the oil may dry in the paint thus making a firm coat of paint on the surface, which will exclude moisture and prevent the evaporation of the oil, thus making the wood almost as lasting as time, and the color to remain as long as the wood lasts; what will be the effect of this addition of spirits of turpentine? The oil is decomposed, and instead of soaking into the wood and slowly drying in the paint to give a firm covering, it is quickly evaporated by the sun, the paint is left a useless powder on the surface; where it is not sheltered from the rain it is soon washed away; and in places where it only gets wet without being washed off, as the qualities of the oil are destroyed, it retains moisture and hastens decay. We have only to go to a house which was painted white and examine the somewhat sheltered spots where they get wet by showers, yet the rain does not beat upon them so as to wash off the paint, and scratch off the paint, and we will find the surface in a state of decay from the paint not excluding the moisture but retaining it. When pine wood is painted it should more especially have only oil and paint without the spirits of turpentine, as there is in the wood turpentine sufficient to injure the oil. If we examine the shingles and weather boarding of a house, wherever we find a knot or fat place, there the oil is decomposed by the turpentine in the wood, and the paint destroyed, even where no spirits of turpentine was added to the paint. Does not this truth, which I believe all will allow, that turpentine makes paint dry quick, prove that instead of soaking into the wood the oil is decomposed and evaporates, show the destructive effect of this addition of spirits of turpentine to paint and although the inside painting to houses remains when turpentine has been added. Yet it would be more durable if the turpentine were left out. The oldest paintings we have, appear as warm and glowing, as when first executed, while the paintings of the first masters of modern times are injured, mostly as I think by the free use of turpentine. The fine paintings of even Sir Joshua Reynold are losing their beauty. By some it is supposed that the paints now used are not as good as they were in former days. 'Tis not the fault of the materials, but the preparation. Oil for instance, and white lead are as good now as they ever were, and were they used without turpentine or anything else, as the painters say, to make them dry, (or as we say to decompose the oil and destroy it.) would last as long and be as good as they ever were. If we calculate the annual amount of money used in the purchase of turpentine and to this add the amount of loss from the injury it does we will find it an enormous expense. From such trials as I have made, I believe the palma christi oil to be superior to flax-seed oil for preserving wood. If the two oils be put on wood, the palma christi oil will be found much more difficult to remove by decomposing with turpentine, which is proof it will be found most durable. Palma christa oil, when properly prepared by boiling is as clear and as good as cold pressed oil. A good acre of land will produce 20 or 30 gallons of it. Planters who wish to paint their buildings would be able to make the best of paint oil by cultivating a few acres of it, and when durability, more than ornament is the object, as in out buildings, gates, &c., giving them two coats palma christa oil, without paint, would have the desired effect. The posts of my pigeon house, which were dipped in palma christa oil, hot, before they were put in the ground, looked like they would last for generations to come; while the posts about the yard, garden, &c., are considerably decayed. Was the exposed six or eight inch of shingles dipped in a hot pot of palma christa oil, the expense would be trifling and they would be everlasting. Some years by neglect, a pot of oil, with which I was experimenting, was spoiled by burning, the roof of the house, which was very low, the building being deep in hill side, I threw the oil on the house roof; on taking this house down a few days ago these shingles were found as sound and as clear of moss as when put on while the others were much decayed. But the durability thus obtained would not be the only object; it is known that all shingles become covered with a mossy growth; this growth is nearly as quick to take fire as spunk: the smallest spark that falls upon it when dry takes fire. Perhaps nine out of ten houses that take fire from sparks falling on the roof, do so from this mossy growth, which never is produced on wood that is oiled; where shingles dipped in hot oil before puting them up, it would be a preventative of fire from sparks. A few days ago during almost a calm at mid day when only a few coals were in the fire place, my house roof was discovered to be on fire. As there was no ladder nor any way of getting to the fire, it seemed as if the house would burn down. A very strong man however, by getting in the window of a house not far off, was able to deaden the fire a little by throwing water with great strength: some drops would reach the fire; thus some little time was given for reflection. A man with great muscular strength with a small hatchet commenced cutting through the ceiling and sheeting. The fire began to blaze, the wind began to rise, all hope of extinguishing the fire was gone: he had however, cut a hole through and was able to tear off the boards and put out the fire, The shingles upon examination were found sound, but they were covered with this mossy growth. A very small spark, must have set it on fire, for upon trial it was found almost as quick to take as gunpowder. Had these shingles been dipped in oil before they were put on the house, I would have been safe from such an accident not only now but for many years to come.

Direct trade with Liverpool.—A merchant of this town informs us that a correspondent of his in Liverpool advises him that he (the correspondent) has a ship on the stocks, and is preparing to put on another, both of which will be run regularly between Liverpool and Wilmington, if sufficient encouragement be given to the enterprise. We commend the matter to the earnest attention of our merchants.—No outlay is required from them for vessels. Nothing more than their favor and patronage. Surely these will be given unhesitatingly.—*Wil. Chron.*

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES, *Editors & Proprietors.*

"Keep a check upon all your Rulers. Do this, and Liberty is safe." *Gen'l Harrison.*

NEW SERIES. VOLUME VII—NUMBER 2.

SALISBURY, N. C., THURSDAY, MAY 23, 1850.

Report of the Select Committee of Thirteen.

Mr. Clay, from the Select Committee of Thirteen, to whom were referred various resolutions relating to California, to other portions of the Territory recently acquired by the United States from the republic of Mexico, and to other subjects connected with the institution of slavery, submitted the following

REPORT:

The committee entered on the discharge of their duties with a deep sense of their great importance, and with earnest and anxious solicitude to arrive at such conclusions as might be satisfactory to the Senate and to the country. Most of the matters referred have been not only subjected to extensive and serious public discussion throughout the country, but to a debate in the Senate itself, singular for its elaborateness and its duration; so that a full exposition of all those motives and views which, on the several subjects confided to the committee have determined the conclusions at which they have arrived, seems quite unnecessary. They will, therefore, restrict themselves to a few general observations, and to some reflections which grow out of those subjects.

Out of our recent territorial acquisitions, and in connexion with the institution of slavery, questions most grave have sprung, which, greatly dividing and agitating the people of the United States, have threatened to disturb the harmony, if not to endanger the safety, of the Union. The committee believe it to be highly desirable and necessary speedily to adjust all those questions, in a spirit of concord, and in a manner to produce, if practicable, general satisfaction. They think it would be unwise to leave any of them open and unsettled, to fester in the public mind, and to prolong, if not aggravate, the existing agitation. It has been their object, therefore, in this report, to make such proposals and recommendations as would accomplish a general adjustment of all those questions.

Among the subjects referred to the committee, which command their first attention, are the resolutions offered to the Senate by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. Bell. By a provision in the resolution of Congress annexing Texas to the United States, it is declared that "new States of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be *entitled to admission* under the provisions of the Federal Constitution; and such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 86° 30′ north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri compromise line, *shall be* admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire."

The committee are unanimously of opinion, that whenever one or more States, formed out of the territory of Texas, not exceeding four, having sufficient population, with the consent of Texas, may apply to be admitted into the Union, they are entitled to such admission, beyond all doubt, upon the clear, unambiguous, and absolute terms of the solemn compact contained in the resolution of annexing adopted by Congress and assented to by Texas. But, whilst the committee conceive that the right of admission into the Union of any new States carved out of the territory of Texas, not exceeding the number specified, and under the conditions stated, cannot be justly controverted, the committee do not think that the formation of any such new States should now originate with Congress. The initiative, in conformity with the usage which has heretofore prevailed, should be taken by a portion of the people of Texas themselves, desirous of constituting a new State, with the consent of Texas. And in the formation of such new State, it will be for the people composing it to decide for themselves whether they will admit or will exclude slavery. And however they may decide that purely municipal question, Congress is bound to acquiesce, and to fulfil in good faith the stipulations of the compact with Texas. The committee are aware that it has been contended that the resolution of Congress annexing Texas was unconstitutional. At a former epoch of our country's history, there were those (and Mr. Jefferson, under whose auspices the treaty of Louisiana was concluded, was among them) who believed that the States formed out of Louisiana could not be received into the Union without an amendment of the Constitution.—But the States of Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, and Iowa have been all, nevertheless admitted. And who would now think of opposing the admission of Minnesota, Oregon, or other new States formed out of ancient province of Louisiana, upon the ground of alleged defect of constitutional power? In grave, national transactions, while yet in their earlier or incipient stages, differences may well exist; but when once they have been decided by a constitutional majority, and are consummated, or are in a process of consummation, there can be no other safe and prudent alternative than to respect the decision already rendered, and to acquiesce in it. Entertaining these views, a majority of the committee do not think it necessary or proper to recommend, at this time, or prospectively, any new State or States to be formed out of the Territory of Texas. Should any such State be hereafter formed, and present itself for admission into the Union, whether with or without the establishment of slavery, it cannot be doubted that Congress will, under a full sense of honor, of good faith, and of all the high obligations arising out of the compact with Texas, decide, just as it will decide under the influence of similar considerations in regard to new States formed of or out of New Mexico and Utah, with or without the institution of slavery, according to the constitutions and judgment of the people who compose them, as to what may be best to promote their happiness.

In considering the question of the admission of California as a State into the Union, a majority of the committee conceive that any irregularity by which that State was organized without the previous authority of an act of Congress ought to be overlooked, in consideration of the omission by Congress to establish any territorial government for the people of California, and the consequent necessity which they were under to create a government for themselves best adapted to their own wants. There are various instances, prior to the case of California, of the admission of new States into the Union without any previous authorization by Congress. The sole condition required by the Constitution of the United States in respect to the admission of a new State is, that its constitution shall be republican in form. California presents such a constitution; and there is no doubt of her having a greater population than that which, according to the practice of the government, has been heretofore deemed sufficient to receive a new State into the Union.

In regard to the proposed boundaries of California, the committee would have been glad if there existed more full and accurate geographical knowledge of the territory which those boundaries include. There is reason to believe that, large as they are, they embrace no very disproportionate quantity of land adapted to cultivation. And it is known that they contain extensive ranges of mountains, deserts of sand, and much productive soil. It might have been, perhaps, better to have assigned to California a more limited front on the Pacific; but even if there had been reserved on the shore of that ocean a portion of the boundary which it presents for any other State or States, it is not very certain that an accessible interior of sufficient extent could have been given to them to render an approach to the ocean through their own limits of any great importance.

A majority of the committee think there are many and urgent concurring considerations in favor of admitting California with the proposed boundaries, and of securing to her at this time the benefits of a State government. If, hereafter, upon an increase of her population, a more thorough exploration of her territory, and an ascertainment of the relations which may arise between the people occupying its various parts, it should be found conducive to their convenience and happiness to form a new State out of California, we have every reason to believe, from past experience, that the question of its admission will be fairly considered and justly decided.

A majority of the committee, therefore, recommend to the Senate the passage of the bill reported by the committee on Territories for the admission of California as a State into the Union. To prevent misconception, the committee also recommend that the amendment reported by the same committee to the bill adopted, so as to leave incontestable the right of the United States to the public domain and other public property in California.

Whilst a majority of the committee believe it to be necessary and proper, under actual circumstances, to admit California, they think it quite as necessary and proper to establish governments for the residue of the territory derived from Mexico, and to bring it within the pale of the Federal authority. The remoteness of that territory from the seat of the General Government; the dispersed state of its population; the variety of races—pure and mixed—of which it consists; the ignorance of some of the races of our laws, languages, and habits; their exposure to inroads and wars of savage tribes; and the solemn stipulations of the treaty by which we acquired dominion over them, impose upon the United States the imperative obligation of extending to them protection and of providing for them government and laws suited to their condition. Congress will fail in the performance of a high duty if it does not give, or attempt to give, to them the benefit of such protection, government, and laws. They are not now, and for a long time to come may not be, prepared for State government. The territorial form, for the present, is best suited to their condition. A bill has been reported by the Committee on Territories, dividing all the territory acquired from Mexico not comprehended within the limits of California into two Territories, under the names of New Mexico and Utah, and proposing for each a territorial government.

The Committee recommend to the Senate the establishment of those territorial governments; and in order more certainly to secure that desirable object, they also recommend that the bill for their establishment be incorporated in the bill for the admission of California, and that, united together, they both be passed.

The combination of the two measures in the same bill is objected to on various grounds. It is said that they are incongruous, and have no necessary connection with each other. A majority of the committee think otherwise. The object of both measures is the establishment of government suited to the conditions respectively, of the proposed new State and of the new Territories. Prior to their transfer to the United States, they both formed a part of Mexico, where they stood in equal relations to the Government of that Republic. They were both ceded to the United States by the same treaty. And in the same article of that treaty, the United States solemnly engaged to protect and govern both. Common in their origin, common in their alienation from one foreign government to another, common in their wants of good government, and conterminous in some of their boundaries, and alike in many particulars of physical condition, they have nearly every thing in common in the relations in which they stand to the rest of this Union. There is then, a general fitness and propriety in extending the parental care of government to both in common. If California, by a sudden and extraordinary augmentation of population, has advanced so rapidly as to mature her for State Government, that furnishes no reason why the less fortunate Territories of New Mexico and Utah should be abandoned and left ungoverned by the United States, or should be disconnected with California, which, although she has organized for herself a State government, must be legally and constitutionally regarded as a Territory until she is actually admitted as a State in the Union.

It is further objected, that by combining the two measures in the same bill, members who may be willing to vote for one and unwilling to vote for the other, would be placed in an embarrassing condition. They would be constrained, it is urged, to take or reject both.—On the other hand, there are other members who would be willing to vote for both united, but would feel themselves constrained to vote against the California bill if it stood alone.—Each party finds in the bill which it favors something which commends it to acceptance, and in the other, something it disapproves.—The true ground, therefore, of the objection to the union of the measures is not any want of affinity between them, but, because of the favor or disfavor with which they are respectively regarded. In this conflict of opinion, it seems to a majority of the committee that a spirit of mutual concession enjoins that the two measures should be connected together; the effect of which will be, that neither opinion will exclusively triumph, and that both may find in such an amicable arrangement enough of good to reconcile them to the acceptance of the combined measure. And such a course of legislation is not at all unusual. Few laws have ever passed in which there were not parts to which exception was taken. It is inexpedient, if not impracticable, to separate these parts, and embody them in distinct bills, so as to accommodate the diversity of opinion which exist. The Constitution of the United States contained in it a great variety of provisions, to some, of which serious objections was made in the convention which formed it by different members of that body; and when it was submitted to the ratification of the States, some of them objected to some parts, and others to other parts of the same instrument. Had these various parts and provisions been separately acted on in the convention, or separately submitted to the people of the United States, it is by no means certain that the Constitution itself would ever have been adopted or ratified. Those who did not like particular provisions found compensation in other parts of it. And in all cases of constitutions and laws, when either is presented as a whole, the question to be decided is, whether the good which it contains is not of greater amount, and does neutralize any thing exceptionable in it. And as nothing human is perfect, for the sake of that harmony so desirable is such a confederacy as this, we must be reconciled to secure as much as we can of what we wish, and be consoled by the reflection that what we do not exactly like is a friendly concession, and agreeable to those who being united with us in a common destiny, it is desirable should always live with us in peace and concord.

A majority of the committee have, therefore, been led to the recommendation to the Senate that two measures be united. The bill for establishing the two Territories, it will be observed, omits the Wilmot proviso, on the one hand, and, on the other, makes no provision for the introduction of slavery into any part of the new Territories. That proviso has been the fruitful source of distraction and agitation. If it were adopted and applied to any territory, it would cease to have any obligatory force as soon as such territory were admitted as a State into the Union. There was never any occasion for it, to accomplish the professed object with which it was originally offered. This has been clearly demonstrated by the current of events. California, of all the recent territorial acquisitions from Mexico, was that in which, if anywhere within them, the introduction of slavery was most likely to take place; and the constitution, has expressly interdicted it. There is the highest degree of probability that Utah and New Mexico will, when they come to be admitted as States, follow the example. The proviso is, as to all these regions in common, a mere abstraction. Why should it be any longer insisted on? Totally destitute, as it is, of any practical import, it has, nevertheless, had the pernicious effect to excite serious, if not alarming, consequences. It is high time that the wounds which it has inflicted should be healed up and closed; and that, to avoid, in all future time, the agitations which must be produced by the conflict of opinion on the slavery question, existing as this institution does in some of the States and prohibited as it is in others, the true principle which ought to regulate the action of Congress in forming territorial governments for each newly acquired domain is to refrain from all legislation on the subject in the territory acquired, so long as it retains the territorial form of government—leaving it to the people of such Territory, when they have attained to a condition which entitles them to admission as a State, to decide for themselves the question of the allowance or prohibition of domestic slavery. The committee believe that they express the anxious desire of an immense majority of the people of the United States, when they declare that it is high time that good feelings, harmony, and fraternal sentiments should be again revived, and that the Government should be able once more to proceed in its great operations to promote the happiness and prosperity of the country undisturbed by this distracting cause.

As for California, far from feeling her sensibility affected by her being associated with other kindred measures—she ought to rejoice and be highly gratified that in entering into the Union, she may have contributed to the tranquility and happiness of the great family of States, of which, it is to be hoped, she may one day be a distinguished member.

The committee beg leave to report on the subject of the northern and western boundary of Texas. On that question a great diversity of opinion has prevailed. According to one view of it, the western limit of Texas was the Nueces; according to another, it extended to the Rio Grande, and stretched from its mouth to its source. A majority of the committee, having come to the conclusion of recommending an amicable adjustment of the boundary with Texas, abstain from expressing any opinion as to the true and legitimate western and northern boundary of that State. The terms proposed for such an adjustment are contained in the bill herewith reported, and they are, with inconsiderable variation the same as that reported by the committee on Territories.

According to these terms, it is proposed to Texas that her boundary be recognised to the Rio Grande, and up that river to the point commonly called El Paso, and running thence up that river twenty miles measured thereon by a straight line, and thence eastwardly to a point where the hundreth degree of west longitude crosses Red river; being the southwest angle in the line designated between the U. States and Mexico, and the same angle in the line of the territory set apart for the Indians by the United States.

If this boundary be assented to by Texas, she will be quietted to that extent in her title.—And some may suppose that, in consideration of this concession by the United States, she might, without any other equivalent, relinquish any claim she has beyond the proposed boundary; that is, any claim to any part of New Mexico. But, under the influence of a sentiment of justice and great liberality, the bill proposes to Texas for her relinquishment of any such claim, a large pecuniary equivalent. As a consideration for it, and considering that a portion of the debt of Texas was created on a pledge to her creditors of the duties on foreign imports transferred by the resolution of annexation to the United States, and now received and receivable in their treasury, a majority of the committee recommended the payment of the sum of —— millions of dollars to Texas, to be applied in the first instance to the extinction of that portion of her debt for the reimbursement of which the duties on foreign imports were pledged as aforesaid; and the residue in such manner as she may direct. The said sum is to be paid in by the United States in a stock, to be created, bearing five per cent. interest annually, payable half yearly at the treasury of the United States, and the principal reimbursable at the end of fourteen years.

According to an estimate which has been made, there are included in the territory to which it is propssed that Texas shall relinquish her claim, embracing that part of New Mexico lying east of the Rio Grande, a little less than 124,933 square miles, and about 79,957 120 acres of land. From the proceeds of sale of this land, the United States may ultimately be reimbursed a portion, if not the whole of the amount of what is thus proposed to be advanced to Texas.

It cannot be anticipated that Texas will decline to accede to these liberal propositions; but if she should, it is to be distinctly understood that the title of the United States to any territory acquired from Mexico East of the Rio Grande will remain unimpaired and in the same condition as if the proposals of adjustment now offered had never been made.

A majority of the committee recommend to the Senate that the section containing these proposals to Texas shall be incorporated into the bill embracing the admission of California as a State, and the establishment of territorial governments for Utah and New Mexico. The definition and establishment of the boundary between New Mexico and Texas has an intimate and necessary connection with the establishment of a territorial government for New Mexico. To form a territorial government for New Mexico, without prescribing the limits of the territory, would leave the work imperfect and incomplete, and might expose New Mexico to serious controversy, if not dangerous collisions, with the State of Texas. And most, if not all, the considerations which unite in favor of combining the bill for admission of California as a State and the territorial bills apply to the boundary question of Texas. By the Union of the three measures, every question of difficulty and division which has arisen out of the territorial acquisitions from Mexico will, it is hoped, be adjusted, or placed in a train of satisfactory adjustment. The committee, availing themselves of the arduous and valuable labors of the Committee on Territories, report a bill, herewith annexed, (marked A,) embracing those three measures, the passage of which, uniting them together, they recommend to the Senate.

The committee will now proceed to the consideration of, and to report upon, the subject of persons owning service or labor in one State escaping into another. The text of the Constitution is quite clear: "No person held to service or labor in one State, *under the laws thereof*, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such labor or service, but *shall be delivered up* on the claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."—Nothing can be more explicit than this language—nothing more manifest than the right to demand, and the obligation to deliver up to the claimant, any such fugitive. And the Constitution addresses itself alike to the States composing the Union and to the General Government. If, indeed, there were any difference in the duty to enforce this portion of the Constitution between the States and the Federal Government, it is more clear that it is that of the former than of the latter. But it is the duty of both. It is now well known and incontestable that citizens in slaveholding States encounter the greatest difficulty in obtaining the benefit of this provision of the Constitution.—The attempt to recapture a fugitive is almost always a subject of great irritation and excitement, and often leads to most unpleasant, if not perilous, collisions. An owner of a slave, it is quite notorious, cannot pursue his property, for the purpose of its recovery, in some of the States, without imminent personal hazard.—This is a deplorable state of things, which ought to be remedied. The law of 1793 has been found wholly ineffectual, and requires more stringent enactments. There is, especially, a deficiency in the number of public functionaries authorized to afford aid in the seizure and arrest of fugitives. Various States have declined to afford aid and co-operation in the surrender of fugitives from labor, as the committee believe, from a misconception of their duty arising under the Constitution of the United States. It is true that a Supreme Court of the United States has given countenance to them in withholding their assistance. But the committee cannot but believe that the intention of the Supreme Court has been misunderstood. They cannot but think that that court merely meant the laws of the several States which created obstacles in the way of the recovery of fugitives were not authorized by the Constitution, and not that State laws affording facilities in the recovery of fugitives were forbidden by that instrument.

The non-slaveholding States, whatever sympathies any of their citizens may feel for persons who escape from other States, cannot discharge themselves from an obligation to enforce the Constitution of the United States. All parts of the instrument being dependent upon, and connected with, each other, ought to be fairly and justly enforced. If some States may seek to exonerate themselves from one portion of the Constitution, other States may endeavor to evade the performance of other portions of it; and thus the instrument, in some of its most important provisions, might become inoperative and invalid.

But, whatever may be the conduct of individual States, the duty of the General Govern-