

coping for refuge within the limits of the state.

Believing that it has been an object with this state to discharge its duty to other and older members of the Union, with more confidence therefore shall we expect their constituted authorities to interpose and assist in bringing to public trial those charged with having violated our penal laws, and who may have fled after insulting the sovereignty of our state. Unfortunately this is not the first instance, and my expectations were that a similar demand would have been previously made.

It can only be a secondary object with the people of this state, to bring to punishment citizens of any other, but it has become necessary to put a stop to these outrages by inflicting punishment as an example to others, or by giving impulse to public opinion, that such attempts are not only criminal, but highly derogatory from the duties mutually due from the citizens of the United States, to the sovereignty and laws of every state in the Union.

Whether the documents upon which the late demand has been made were sufficient or otherwise, they were such as were certified to me by the order of the circuit court for the county of Harrison, under whose jurisdiction the indictments were found, with the expectation that in relation thereto, I should discharge my duty. If however, there shall have been clerical or other mistakes upon this subject they would have grounds of defence, when the individuals charged should have been put on their trial. The act of congress in such cases made and provided, renders an *ex parte affidavit* made charging the person or persons so demanded, with having committed treason, felony or other crime, sufficient to support such demand, and it is difficult to conclude that the documents accompanying the demand alluded to, are not more substantial in good faith, than that of an affidavit.

The first object of this government will be to insure the execution of its laws with which its sovereignty is inseparably connected, and it will be for the government of Kentucky to explain to the citizens of this state, the principles and reasons upon which your excellency declines an interference.

Permit me to solicit an early reply, accompanied with the indictments forwarded by Gen. Tipton, late the agent for the state; and accept the assurance of my high respect, as well to yourself, as to the state over which you preside.

J. JENNINGS.

His excellency G. A. Slaughter, gov. of Ky.

To the House of Representatives of the state of Indiana.

Since my message of the 15th instant, I have received another communication relative to the fugitives from the justice of this state, from the gov. of Kentucky, accompanied by copies of the indictments certified to me from the Harrison circuit court, upon which the demand was made.

Copies of the letter, together with copies of the indictments, are herewith laid before the general assembly.

J. JENNINGS.

Jan. 17th, 1820.

STATE OF KENTUCKY.
Executive office, Jan 8, 1820.
His excellency, J. Jennings,
Sir—I have had the honor of

receiving your Excellency's letter of the 24th ult. in answer to mine of the 11th of said month, in which I informed your excellency, that as the demand made on me, by your letter of the 30th November, and the documents forwarded therewith of certain persons, as fugitives from justice; I must decline interfering, as the case was not brought within the constitution and laws in such cases provided.

It has always been the object of the government of this state to promptly discharge its duty as a member of the Federal Union, as well to the national government, as that of the co-ordinate states.

Our Federal Constitution has wisely entrusted to the general government, the enacting of laws which shall point out the mode and manner of making applications for fugitives from justice; and the consequent duties of the Executive of the state applied to in such cases.

Looking then to the provisions of the laws of congress, on this subject, and to the letter of your Excellency, and the document accompanying the same, I could entertain no doubt but that they did not meet the requisition of the law. In this opinion I was fortified by the opinion of several gentlemen of the first respectability, who were consulted by me, & in whose knowledge of the constitution and laws of the country, great confidence ought to be placed, and upon a review of that opinion, I have no cause to doubt its correctness.

I will take this occasion to remark, that the decision which I formed arose not from any alleged circumstance of the case, but would have governed on a similar application from any other state, and for any other alleged crime.

I therefore forbore making any remarks on the particular case, or upon the particular time chosen for making this application, considering the period which has elapsed since the transaction is alleged to have taken place.

It would be gratifying to me in the discharge of my official duty, to meet the approbation of any section of our common country, that may be effected by any of my official acts. A careful regard to what the best dictates of my judgement point out as my duty to all concerned, must however, be the means used to attain that end.

I have been thus explicit with your excellency, as from the tenor of your letter, it would seem you had taken up the idea, that in the course I had taken on this subject, there was not a proper respect paid to the constituted authorities of your state — than which, nothing could have been further from my intentions.

I inclose, in pursuance of your request, the documents sent with your former letter.

You will discover amongst other things in relation to them, that there is no evidence that they were found by the grand jury.

And it must always be a matter of duty in the executive of the state applied to, to judge of the sufficiency of the documents on which he is called upon to cause a citizen to be arrested.

I have the honor to be, your excellency's most ob't.

GAB'L SLAUGHTER.
(To be concluded in our next.)

If the following disgraceful statement be not a mere hoax, the unfortunate town of HARTFORD will be famous in after

story for more than one unfortunate incident in its history. It is to be hoped that no man who calls himself a *Tolerationist*, was so shamefully inconsistent with his professions, as to have had any hand in this proceeding.

Hartford, Cont. Feb. 21.

A Senator burnt in effigy.— We think it proper to state, for the information of Mr. Senator Lanman, that his late vote upon the Missouri subject, excites the universal indignation of this community. An evidence of the popular feeling upon this occasion was exhibited in this city on Thursday night, about nine o'clock, when a large number of people assembled in the yard of the State house, and burnt Mr. Senator in effigy.— A transparency was displayed, bearing the words in large letters, "Lanman and Slavery." We cannot, however, but regret the occurrence, as popular outrages of the kind, are never calculated to do good. If Mr. Lanman has disgraced his constituents, the people can apply the remedy at the election, by selecting rulers of more principle, capacity and independence.

Mirror.

The Hartford *Tutor and Fe*.—The Hartford Times, received by yesterday's mail, has given a well merited castigation to the abettors of the shameful outrage, of which we took some notice in our last. The following is no doubt a correct account of the transaction referred to:

"It is with no common feelings of indignation, that I notice an outrage which occurred in this city on the evening of Thursday last. Some boys who have not yet grown to be men, and some men who have not yet ceased to be boys, about nine o'clock, collected in the State House yard, being the most public and central spot in the city, and, having prepared and brought there a swivel, a barrel of tar, and what they called an effigy of the Hon. Mr. Lanman, a Senator in Congress from this state, the swivel was discharged, and, at that same instant, the tar being set on fire, the effigy was consumed with the flame. A transparency is said to have been displayed exhibiting in large capitals the words "Lanman and Slavery." The instruments of this vile and disgraceful outrage immediately fled, and have not yet been discovered. If they are found out they will be undoubtedly prosecuted."

By the remarks of the Times which follow this extract, and for which we have no room, we are happy to find that no *Tolerationist* has been so far faithless to his professions, as to have any concern in this affair. There is but one opinion about it, every where expressed. This is not a government in which turbulence and violence can make proselytes, or prostrate political adversaries. The cries *Hep! hep!* and *No Popery!* belong to other climes and to other people. In this country, men will acquire popularity precisely in the degree in which they are persecuted. And what persecution can be more odious, in the eyes of a freeman and a Republican, than that which pursues men with vulgar menaces and effigied flames for a conscientious discharge of a public duty.

Nat. Intel.

Congressional proceedings.

House of Representatives.

February 25.

MISSOURI BILL.

The speaker having announced the orders of the day.

Mr. Hill of Massachusetts, rose, and said he did not now wish to consume the time of the house upon a subject, the progress of which seemed to be stamped with all the marks of eternity. But he rose merely to move that the committee of the whole be discharged from any further consideration of the Missouri bill.

Mr. Lowndes said, that if the gentleman from Massachusetts insisted upon the motion being put, he would cheerfully vote in favor of it; yet if he would consent to withdraw his motion for the present, to give two or three gentlemen an opportunity to speak to-day, he thought it might be a saving of time, and the motion could be renewed again, if necessary, to-morrow morning, which would then, he thought, receive a decided support.

Mr. Hill acquiesced in this suggestion, and withdrew his motion.

The house then again went to a committee of the whole, Mr. Cobb in the chair on this bill.

Mr. Ervin, of S. C. took the floor, and spoke at considerable length against the restriction.

Mr. Scott of Missouri, next rose and spoke more than an hour on the same side.

Mr. Meigs of New York, spoke some time also against the restriction.

Mr. Adams of Massachusetts, made a few remarks in favor of the restriction; and

Mr. Tucker of Virginia, spoke more than hour against the amendment. When he concluded; (about 4 o'clock)

Mr. Smith of Maryland, rose and observed, that a large number of his constituents had expressed their opinion in opposition to the opinion which he was known to entertain on this subject, and it might be presumed that he desired to deliver his reasons for the vote which he should give. But Mr. S. said the public business was suffering by the protraction of the debate; the members are weary of it; every one's opinion was made up on it; & he was unwilling to consume the time of the committee by any remarks on the question. He therefore forbore, and he hoped the question would be taken.

Mr. Walker of N. C. rose then to address the committee on the question, but the question was called for so clamorously and so perseveringly, that Mr. W. could proceed no farther than to move that the committee rise.

The committee refused to rise, by an almost unanimous vote.

Mr. Beecher of Ohio, then stated that it was his wish to be heard on the question; and, if not allowed an opportunity of speaking in committee, he should do so in the house, unless prevented by force; and he moved that the committee should then rise.

This motion was lost by a large majority.

After some farther debate, the question was taken on Mr. Taylor's proposed restriction, and agreed to, by from 12 to 18 votes.

Mr. Taylor then moved that the committee rise, as he presumed it was not prepared to go into the various details of the bill this evening, several of which were important, & would give rise to many questions.

This motion was opposed by Mr. Scott and Mr. Strother, and supported by Mr. Sargent. It, however, finally prevailed, and

The committee obtained leave — ayes 90 — to sit again.

Saturday, Feb. 26.
IN SENATE.

THE MAINE BILL.

The senate proceeded to the consideration of the message from the house of representatives disagreeing to the amendment of this body to the bill for the admission of Missouri into the union. [This amendment embraces nine sections, the first eight of which contain provisions for the admission of Missouri into the union; the 9th prohibits the further introduction of slavery into the territories of the United States.]

The question of order on the susceptibility of *division* of a question on a motion to *recede*, so as to take it separately and successively on each part, being yet under consideration, Mr. Otis, Mr. Buril, and Mr. Morril, successively spoke briefly on the question.

House of Representatives.

MISSOURI BILL.

The order of the day being announced from the chair;—being the unfinished business of yesterday,

Mr. Hill renewed the motion which he made yesterday, that the committee of the whole house be discharged from the further consideration of the Missouri Bill; but the motion was not sustained by a majority of the house.

The house then again resolved itself into a committee of the whole, Mr. Cobb in the chair, on the said bill.

Mr. Storrs, of New York, moved to amend the bill, by inserting in the 4th section, (immediately preceding the restrictive amendment adopted yesterday,) the following proviso:

That in that tract of country ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes north latitude, excepting only such part thereof as is included within the limits of the state contemplated by this act, there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted: *provided always*, That any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed, may be lawfully reclaimed, and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service, as aforesaid.

Mr. Storrs supported his amendment in a speech of considerable length—embracing, incidentally, in the range of his remarks, an examination of the right of imposing the slavery restriction on Missouri.

Mr. Randolph next rose, and spoke more than four hours, against the amendment, and on the topics connected with it, the subject of restriction, &c. When he had concluded, (about half past four o'clock.)

An ineffectual motion was made for the committee to rise.

Mr. Beecher, of Ohio, then took the floor, and proceeded a short time in a speech on the subject, when he gave way for a motion for the committee to rise, which prevailed, and about 5 o'clock.

The House adjourned;

IN SENATE.

Monday, February 25.

Mr. Lloyd, of Maryland, submitted for consideration the following resolution:

Resolved, That the committee on public lands be instructed to enquire into the expediency of making appropriations of public lands for the support and