

Parker then supposed to be Eliya Probus, the fugitive slave of Mr. Dickeyhut. It is also certain that he carried with him the authority of a power of attorney from the owner of the alleged fugitive, or her agent, designating to act under it in good faith. It is likewise well known that he captured Rachel Parker, believing her to be Eliya Probus. Neither can it be denied that he had good reason for so believing, not only from the information received in the neighborhood, but also from the extraordinary likeness which exists between Rachel Parker and Eliya Probus, and upon which some of the most respectable citizens of Baltimore were prepared to swear to the fact of identity. From these premises, the conclusion is irresistibly drawn, that Thomas McBready is not a criminal. The presumption of malicious intent necessary to constitute crime is absolutely rebutted by the facts of the case. If guilty at all under the law, his guilt is purely technical. He is morally innocent beyond the shadow of a doubt. The first question which arises, therefore, is, would it be just for the laws of Pennsylvania to punish a man under such circumstances? The next question is, can I consent that a citizen of Maryland should be exposed to the hazard of an unjust prosecution? It is unnecessary for me to assure you that the people and government of this State hold the crime of kidnapping in the deepest abhorrence, and that our laws visit it with the severest punishment. But that is not the enquiry here. The question is, whether or not, being perfectly satisfied of the moral innocence of the accused, I shall send him into another state for trial. It is extremely ~~unpleasant~~ <sup>hospitable</sup> to make any allusions, whatsoever, which may be supposed to reflect ungraciously upon any of the citizens of another and friendly state; nevertheless it is my duty to remind your Excellency, that very strong and unreasonable prejudices, touching the subject matter of McBready's alleged offence, prevail in the County where he ~~was~~ <sup>has been</sup> indicted, which would render the result of his trial exceedingly uncertain. I could not, therefore, consent to expose him to the risk, unless I felt constrained to do so, by the mandate of the Federal Constitution. Without entering into an argument upon this point, it is sufficient to say, that I consider the case of McBready fully within the scope of that discretion in regard ~~to~~ <sup>against</sup> requisition, which has always been claimed and exercised by the Executives of the different States of the Union.