

as I received fifteen thousand more votes than the highest candidate at the Presidential election the preceding year, and when a very large vote was polled in the State. But your Excellency will, I think, find that no such order as the present was ever issued by Genl. Dix.

It is, besides, of some importance to note the difference in the condition of our State between that time and now. Her present condition requires no comment; but then, I beg leave to remind you, she was hovering upon the brink of secession. Her legislators had been arrested but a short time before, to prevent them passing an ordinance for that purpose; and at the election referred to there was an organized secession party, under the guise of a peace party, with a nominated ticket in every County, and believed to be then actuated with the determination to carry the State into Rebellion.

Under these circumstances, what was the order issued by Genl. Dix? It was issued on the 1st November 1861, and, referring to the authority vested in him "to arrest all persons in rebellion against the United States", proceeded to direct the arrest of persons appearing at the polls "known to have been recently in Virginia bearing arms against the authority and forces of the United States, and who have returned to their former homes with the view of taking part in the election"; as also of "other individuals, lately residents of Maryland, who have been engaged in similar acts of hostility, or actively engaged in aiding and abetting those in arms".

The class of persons to be arrested, it will be observed, is much more distinctly marked than by the order of Genl. Schenck, and there is consequently much less margin for mistake or abuse of authority. Not only so, but the order does not seem to have applied to the proper residents of the State, but only to returning rebels; and so far from being "precisely" what Genl. Schenck has now directed, it not only contains no expression which can by any implication be tortured into a menace of the judges of election, but prescribes no oath of allegiance or any other oath to be taken by any one.

I find no allusion in your Excellency's letter to the fact adverted to in mine, that no military intervention or test oath was ordered in either of the late important elections that have taken place in Pennsylvania and Ohio. If your Excellency cannot, as you say, confidently rely even upon loyal men "whose election may have depended on disloyal votes," and therefore cannot recognize the force of my suggestion that nearly all our candidates are loyal, it is difficult to see what reliance you could have reposed in such a candidate as Mr. Vallandigham, and quite as difficult for us to understand why such a discrimination has been allowed against a State whose citizens claim to be, if not as numerous, at least as loyal as those of any other.

I have the honor to be
Your obedient servant
A. W. Bradford