

Council Chamber Alexandria Aug 7 1825

Sir,

Mr Thompson arrived here last evening with a letter from His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor of Virginia explaining the reasons which influenced the Executive Council to decline delivering up Peter alias Cannon in compliance with the demand. I have taken measures to obtain (if I can) such a deposition from this State, as seems to be required, and have also addressed a letter to His Excellency the Lieut Governor in answer to his and asking certain information which if we fail in getting a proper deposition here it is important that we receive a speedy reply to.

You will remain at Richmond until you hear further from me. Nothing on my part shall be wanting to expedite the business and enable you to return home either with, or without the prisoners.

Major Thomas Harris  
now at  
Richmond

Remain very respectfully,  
Yours &c. &c.  
Thos. Caldwell Clerk

Council Chamber Alexandria Aug 7 1825

Sir,

Your communication of the 1<sup>st</sup> inst in which you assign the reasons which influenced the Executive of Virginia, in declining to comply with the demand of His Excellency the Governor of this State of John Peter alias Cannon and a justice from Justice was received by me yesterday evening in the absence of His Excellency from the Seal of Government.

I have taken steps to procure (if it can be done) such a deposition as from the communication of your Excellency appears to be deemed necessary.

It was known at the time of making the demand that it was not in technical conformity to the letter of the act of Congress but was believed to be clearly within its spirit and object. It is true that the act of Congress provides that when a demand is made by the Executive Authority of one State upon another that the authenticity of the evidence accompanying the demand should be certified by the Executive making the demand. But what is the object of the act in requiring such certificate? Most certainly to assure the Executive upon whom the demand is made that the documents are genuine and official. Did the Executive of Virginia need any such assurance in relation to documents bearing the signature of Officers of that State in May would it not have seemed like supererogation at least if not indelicacy and encroachment upon your rights for the Executive of Maryland to have furnished such certificate and if it has been done is now believed to be authorized to do so?

The foregoing observations are made upon the act of Congress