

I had granted the reprieve - what then? Are they not citizens, and have they not a right to be heard? Was I not approached by a Protestant Clergyman in the case of negro Green, and did I not grant, solely upon his application, a reprieve longer than the one given to Comod? Moreover, suppose that I tell the Editor of the Clipper that I have been several times solicited by Protestant Ministers not only to pardon Criminals, but to appoint friends to office - will they be scandalized? These Ministers were always received by me with the courtesy due to their personal and religious character; and they were often gratified in their wishes; not because they were Clergymen or influential Citizens, but because their applications appeared to be just and proper in themselves. Shall any man presume to require of me that, because I am a Catholic, I shall refuse to a Catholic Clergyman or layman, the right of petition, which I would not deny to the humblest of my Constituents? And, is it supposed that the oath which I have taken may be falsified through the fear of ignorant or malicious clamor? I have not forgotten the lesson, learned in my youth, that he who shrinks before the face of a tyrant, or yields up his honest resolution, at the command even of an excited multitude, is a coward in his heart. The Editor of the Clipper may be well assured, that no clamor, no misrepresentation, no threat, no hope of earthly gain or fear of earthly loss shall move me one jot, nor make me forget what I owe to my duty as the Governor of Maryland.

Suppose, then, that I had been induced by the sufficient argument of a Catholic Clergyman to reprieve Comod, it would nevertheless be false to charge that I was influenced by Sectarian Considerations, or that Sectarian Appeals had been made. But it happens that even that is not so. No Catholic Clergyman whatever, and no Catholic layman, as a Catholic, ever approached me, directly or indirectly, in behalf of Comod. The reprieve was granted on Thursday the 7th instant, at the earnest solicitation of one of the Jurors, and upon his solemn assurance that there was important testimony believed to be attainable which had not been before the Jury at the trial and which would strongly tend to rebut the presumption of that deliberate and premeditated malice, on the part of the Criminal, which the law holds to be necessary to constitute Murder in the first degree. Ordinary humanity, and the first principles of Justice required that case, at least, should be given for a full hearing, before life was taken - and I gave it. No right thinking man