

human reason to escape the conclusion that this report goes beyond them both.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Will the gentleman explain to whom he refers; who had not the right to vote, and may vote now?

Mr. MILLER. The soldiers in the field.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. How is that?

Mr. MILLER. I say that it is by another section of this report. The gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) tried by act of assembly to provide for allowing soldiers to vote; but by a very large majority in the senate, after a full discussion of the subject, it was decided that under your present constitution you could not allow the vote of the soldier to be taken outside of the State of Maryland. They must come back into the State, into the county, and into the precinct or election district where they resided, before they could vote. That was the decision of the last legislature of the State. It was attempted to be incorporated into this very convention bill, that the soldiers might vote; and it was voted down. I may be mistaken in saying that it was attempted to be put into this bill; but there was an act allowing your soldiers to vote upon the question of calling this convention or not, and the legislature voted it down because they had no constitutional power to pass it; and they could not have incorporated it into this bill, because it was the decision of the legislature at that time, clear and unquestioned upon the law. The supreme court of Pennsylvania had decided the same thing in reference to the provisions of their constitution. The supreme court of Connecticut had decided the same thing with reference to their constitution, and in New York the same thing. They had to amend their constitution before they could allow the soldiers out of the State to vote.

(The allotted time, twenty minutes, having expired, the hammer fell.)

Mr. SANDS. I feel it my duty to say a word or two in respect to some things that have been announced on this floor, both as matters of fact and as matters of law. The gentleman from Kent (Mr. Chambers) made a most effective appeal to this body on the subject of his personal connection with those who were in armed hostility to the United States. I think from my personal knowledge of the circumstances in that case, I can safely appeal to the gentleman from Kent, and ask him whether ever a prisoner of war was more humanely and kindly treated than his relative; if ever those who were discharging the functions of government and who were its friends, showed more disposition to give access to a prisoner by his friends, and in every way and manner possible to conduce to the comfort and welfare of such a prisoner?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I have not said one word to the contrary. On the contrary, I take pleasure in saying that those with whom I

have conferred, officers to whom I have applied, invariably treated me with the utmost respect. They have not permitted me, but they have permitted members of my family to go and see this man, and have allowed me to furnish means of aiding and comforting him.

Mr. SANDS. That is the truth he has spoken, to the honor and credit of the government of the United States and its authorities. Its treatment of its prisoners of war has never been exceeded in kindness and liberality, and all that is noble and ennobling. It may do to talk about the gibbets being erected for our friends, when they are working for a particular view; but when they are called upon for the truth of the fact, out of the mouths of those most interested you have the truth. I thank God to-night that the government and its agents have been pre-eminently humane, kind, and liberal. I am sorry that the facts of to-day do not show that those who are in the control of the rebellion are acting in a like spirit of christian charity and kindness. The world knows the facts; and I do not choose to consume any more time in talking about them. But I want it plainly and distinctly understood that I listen with no degree of patience whatsoever to appeals, however eloquent, that set up the spectres of the gibbet between the grandfather and the grandchild, when it is but a spectre; when it is but the shadow of a shade; when it has no foundation whatever in reality.

Nor need the gentleman or any of his friends indulge in one moment's anxiety or apprehension that they are to be excluded from the ballot box because by the permission of the government and its authorities and through its agents, they have ministered to their friends. That is not adhering to, giving aid and comfort in its legal sense, or in the sense in which it stands embodied in this report. The gentleman knows that. It is a different thing from that. It is a secret, persistent, active sympathy and aid giving, not to the personal relative or the personal friend, which is aimed at. It is the energetic and persistent giving aid and comfort to rebellion, which is to disqualify; and I say under the law,—I say it to my friend who addressed this house, under the strict letter of the law, that is a disqualification from voting. The gentleman can find it in the very language that has been read. In this oath that was to be put by the judges of election, what do you find? This is the language, for a few words cover it all:

—“or has either directly or indirectly given aid, comfort, or encouragement to those in armed rebellion against the government of the United States.”

Does the gentleman say that in these words, the conveying of intelligence useful to the public enemy and hurtful to the public cause, is not included? He can hardly make such a declaration as that here as his recorded opinion.