

And this Bradley T. Johnson, late chairman of the State democratic central committee of Maryland, if he is not now, is he to be allowed to vote? I cite him only as a more prominent actor in these scenes. Who commanded the rebel ram, the Tennessee? A Marylander, Buchanan. Who commanded the Alabama? The Marylander, Semmes. And who is now roaming over the ocean in the Tallahassee? The Marylander, Wood. Are these men to come back here and vote? I say it is our right and our duty to protect the ballot-box so that they shall be excluded.

I come to another point. Are these the only ones to be excluded? I refer in no spirit of unkindness to the gentleman behind me from Kent county (Mr. Chambers.) or to his grandson who has figured repeatedly in the debates upon this floor. I refer to it precisely as the gentleman has, as an illustration of a principle, and nothing else. That young man stands precisely in the category of those others. Now, the question is asked, he put it himself, shall he be disfranchised, deprived of the right to vote under this constitution, because he visited him and ministered to his wants when wounded and suffering? I beg leave to answer that question; and to say that that depends very much upon circumstances. If that young man joined the rebels who were warring upon our national government, and who came here to plunder our State, incited thereto by his venerable grandparent, and encouraged therein, and that grandparent giving him aid to accomplish this infernal purpose, then that grandparent is so far accessory to the act that he should be punished accordingly.

Mr. CHAMBERS (interposing.) The grandfather tells you that he did no such thing. The young man for years had been a resident of the South, and I had neither seen him nor had correspondence with him. The gentleman talks about assuming a case for the sake of illustration. The gentleman has no right to assume a state of facts which are offensive.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I believe on a former occasion the gentleman from Kent did state the facts which he now repeats; but it had escaped my memory. I shall refer to it in different terms. I will suppose that he had been residing in Kent county when the war commenced.

Mr. CHAMBERS. You have no right to suppose it.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I say, *suppose* that to have been the case, as it was the case with thousands, upon that hypothesis I will repeat every word I have uttered, because that is the case with many. But if that soldier wounded, if he had ceased to be an enemy, and was wounded and a prisoner, no one supposes for a moment that under the provisions of this article, he who administered to his wants

would be any more obnoxious to any penalty than the surgeon who dressed his wounds, or the quartermaster who supplied his wants.—But there have been cases—we have known them—gentlemen here know them just as well as they know their own existence, where brothers and sons, fathers and grandfathers, have armed the hand that has been raised to strike the parricidal blow, have prepared the means with deliberate purpose and intent to pull down the pillars of our national edifice. I say that every right-minded man will concur with me that those who have done this act, inciting the young and more thoughtless to pursue this infamous course, are more guilty, more justly obnoxious, than those who have actually done the act and placed their lives in peril in doing it.

As I said at the outset, this is a war against the decision of the ballot-box which we want to maintain. It comes with very singular grace from gentlemen to be upholding and protecting the ballot-box with one hand, while with the other they wield the sword which shall destroy its decisions forever. I spoke of the resolution which came flashing from Chicago. I ask gentlemen to note its terms:

3d. *Resolved*, That the direct interference of the military authority of the United States in the recent elections held in Kentucky, MARYLAND, Missouri and Delaware was a shameful violation of the constitution, and a *repetition of such acts in the approaching elections will be held as revolutionary*, AND RESISTED WITH ALL THE MEANS AND POWER UNDER OUR CONTROL.

What does that amount to? Gentlemen talk about military interference. When? The gentleman whose seat is vacant here upon this floor to-day, (Mr. Jones, of Somerset,) is reported to have been sitting there at that time, and did not repel the slander. If there were any such interference, which is to justify this resistance hereafter to the decisions of the ballot-box if it should put us in the majority, it was either at the election in the fall of 1863, or at the election which sent us here. Was it in the election of the fall of 1863? Where were the contested elections of that year? It was easy enough to prove it. There was one sent here from Somerset county for adjudication; and how was it adjudicated? The very gentleman now holding his seat at Chicago (Mr. Jones, of Somerset,) was the very man who came here, and with all his influence and eloquence showed that it was a lawful and legal election. And where are the contested elections of this body? Gentlemen have talked here of military interference. Is not this convention law broad enough? Was there military interference in the State to justify this language? If there had been the judge was under obligation to send a certificate to that effect to the governor.

Mr. STIRLING. They did in one instance.