

Mr. BARRON. Will the gentleman allow the secretary to read the article?

The secretary read the article as follows:

REBEL INSINCERITY.

*Messrs. Editors Baltimore American:*

Owing to the apparent indiscriminate plunder of the rebels, while in some parts of this State, their friends and abettors are endeavoring to create the impression that they too are anxious that such measures may be taken as to prevent another invasion. The stories which many of these domestic traitors narrate of losing horses, cattle, and various other species of property, are certainly very touching; and were not their base designs so well known to us, we might be cheated into the belief that they are really sincere in their expressed desire to keep the enemy beyond the Potomac. It is not improbable, however, but that a few of the secession sympathizers were sufferers from the recent raid to as great a degree as the Union men. Ruffians with so little principle as to rob a man of the last dollar in his pocket, would not hesitate to take a horse if they wanted him, no difference whether he belonged to friend or foe. But would three thousand cavalymen, under the personal command of Bradley T. Johnson, be likely to take fifty or sixty barrels of corn, together with other grain of equal value, from one of the leading secessionists in the State, and not pay him for it? Is it probable that men, who had been acting as rebel spies and emissaries during the war; who had known for six weeks that the State would be invaded; who rejoiced at the base idea of the capture of Washington; who accompanied the enemy night and day while he was in our midst pointing out Union men, and piloting him through the country; is it probable, we ask, that such men would receive the same treatment at the hands of General Johnson, as those who support and defend the government? Though our opinion of southern chivalry is not very elevated, we cannot believe that he would treat all alike. But thus the traitors would have us believe. We take a special case.

During the passage of General Johnson from the northern part of the State towards Beltsville he and his whole command, numbering about three thousand, bivouacked for a night on the farm of a member of our convention, and one of the most influential and open secessionists in his part of the country. On account of his southern proclivities he, though elected to the convention, was himself not allowed to vote at the election. Since the convention assembled he has been one of the few vile traitors who have used every method to defeat the expressed wishes of the people of the State, and he has given, on all possible occasions, official countenance, if not assistance to the rebels in arms. Now, this man alleges that General Johnson, who was at the

same time enjoying the hospitality of his roof, took corn, oats, &c., from him to the amount of several thousand dollars, for which he made no compensation. Is not this an improbable tale? Who, that has the least spark of common sense, can be made to believe it? General Bradley T. Johnson rob the very man who had rendered him so much assistance. Such an idea cannot be entertained. The rebels had but a few days before received two hundred thousand dollars from the citizens of Frederick, and this, together with what had been robbed of private individuals, would make a sum, in possession of his brigade, not far short of three hundred thousand dollars. So this story cannot even be supported by the plea that the rebels had no money. And when this money was levied or stolen from the citizens of Frederick and elsewhere, the intention must have been to spend it in this or some northern State, for we cannot believe that the bogus currency of the United States government would be received at the South.

What we have said of this prominent secessionist is equally true of many others of the same stamp. If their grain and horses were taken, they received in most cases an equivalent for them. And knowing that these individuals are in no sense sufferers from the raid alike with Union men, let us be more than ever suspicious when they go about the country, bemoaning their losses and expressing a desire that the "confederates have paid us their last visit." If there ever was a time when the government should make active preparations to defend the border, it is now.

While the sympathizers here profess to be incensed at the atrocities of the rebels, they are doubtless, as a few weeks ago, making preparations to receive them in our midst. We have no reason to believe that the enemy will not soon attempt to cross over again. If his object before was booty, there are many horses and much grain still in the State. If it was to make demonstrations against Washington, the city can be taken as easily now as it could have been a week ago. If, finally, as is believed by military men, the object of the raid was to raise the siege of Richmond, it might yet be done by throwing a force in this State sufficiently large to threaten the safety of Baltimore and Washington. Have we the Potomac efficiently guarded against another raid? This is a question which the government should give a timely consideration. If the rebels are allowed to cross over and plunder our citizens at will, the soil of Maryland will cease to be cultivated in the future. We have heard many of the leading farmers and merchants, who live near the border, express their intention of moving North and leaving all behind them, rather than suffer the anxiety and loss incident upon rebel raids. It is true that where there is such an extent of country to operate