

implication expressed and conveyed his belief, were ever uttered. I utterly and totally deny that in any of the armies of the United States in any single instance, were the words which the gentleman has seen in the papers ever uttered. I deny that the expressions he quoted were ever seen in a print, of which either the editors or the printers were loyal men.

Fortunately the record against the gentleman is on the page of history, that there were found in the Ohio regiments, in some companies one, in others two, in others five men, that in spite of the martial law of which he has spoken, did venture to vote for a man who at the hands of this country has not even the last right of a dying foe, the right of burial—the traitor Vallandigham Martial law, in which soldiers of the United States could be allowed to vote for a thing so contemptible that God has not given in any human language as yet formed, a term of contempt strong enough to utter of him—a man destitute of all that makes a man—a man whom even the omnipotent God having formed must have been ashamed of, when he looked upon him, and remembered that it was the work of his creative hand?

I am tired of hearing arguments advanced on high grounds when I know the motive to be the killing of measures for fear the votes of the loyal soldiers of the United States would carry them and no others. The gentleman, as I believe, argues against the soldiers voting, because he knows that every soldier from Maryland will vote for the prosecution of this war, for sustaining the government of this country, and for sustaining the principles of republican liberty of which the gentleman professes to be fond. He opposes every measure, and votes against every measure proposed here, by which men in arms against the government of this country, and against the State of Maryland shall be prevented from voting. His vote is upon the journal, objecting that an oath should be applied to the citizens of Maryland who have been in arms against their State and against the general government. Objecting to that, he yet upon the high ground of the love of the republican institutions of the government handed down to us by our fathers, objects to the soldiers in the armies of the United States voting.

I guarantee that there would not have been found one soldier in the army of the United States voting against the application of this oath to any rebel in arms. I guarantee that you would not find one single man who loved the government that his fathers handed down better than aught else, that would have voted against the proposition to apply this oath. Let us test opinions and sentiments by the fact and by the record. Let us give just that weight to the love of republican institutions and love of this government which their actions have proved individuals to feel. Voting

against every resolution of condemnation against traitors, against thieves and murderers that has been introduced into this convention, the gentleman comes to us to-day with his love of republican institutions and the government of our fathers! Voting against every instinct of freedom, he comes and tells us of being animated by the same spirit that animated the men of 1776! Coming to us with statements from newspapers, the names of which newspapers he does not even remember, and he knows not whether they were loyal or disloyal!

Does the gentleman suppose that there is any parallel between the armies of France and the armies of Maryland? Does the gentleman know that these men in the armies of the United States have gladly gone preferring death? Does he know that the armies of France have never gladly gone, but have been taken by a ruthless conscription? As a historic fact I deny that the people of France were in the slightest degree influenced by the vote of the army; and I declare that the gentleman has made an unwarrantable assumption of which he cannot bring any proof. Denial is better than assertion, in that the burden of proof lies upon the asserter.

Despotism in this country? From what the gentleman has said, it seems that he believes the support of the principles of our government to be despotism. I have heard the gentleman argue here bravely that we are now under the tyranny of the federal government. Haply that is what he meant by putting our government under a tyranny. Haply he meant that a republican President would be the tyranny that would be effected. Haply he meant that the destruction of slavery would be the wrong under which the State of Maryland would groan. Haply the despotism he meant, that was so to be feared, was the triumph of freedom throughout the land.

If that be so, and if I have rightly interpreted the meaning of the gentlemen, I think that he is wise; for I think the vote of the armies of the republic will be for freedom, will be for a President that shall carry out those instincts of freedom, and will not be for the nominee of the Chicago convention. I doubt me the gentleman thinks that if aught else than the nominee of the Chicago convention be put in the presidential chair, the United States will groan under a tyranny. If that be the interpretation of his words, I am happy to say that I think a despotism so strong will rule this land that the nominee of the Chicago convention will never have half a chance.

Why not call things by their right name? Why not put it fairly and squarely upon the true ground? If it is an instinct of freedom and a desire for republican institutions, how can he go with the man who will take the flag of our country from its present altitude of victory, and lower it before the oppressor,