

fluence of existing events around us. Far be it, I hope, from the good people of this State, and from their representatives anywhere, to indulge in a process subversive of every principle which we have regarded, and which we now regard as necessary for the welfare of the State, and the security of the citizen. The more I think of this, the more I indulge the hope that there are gentlemen here who will pause.

What is to be the effect of this? It is a matter of perfect knowledge, I suppose, with every gentleman upon this floor, that there are men charged with principles of secession, who are as far from entertaining them as any man upon this floor. Yet, if the military officer should come into the neighborhood, and be informed by any person, influenced perhaps by the worst and most evil passion, by personal hatred or malevolent feelings, that such persons have secession principles, they would be charged with secession, and that would be the end of it. I do not care how fair may have been the whole life and conduct of any such person, he would have no tribunal to resort to, no witness to examine.

I am not to be told that this is not to be the case. It has been the case. My friend from Queen Anne's now absent, (Mr. Brown,) is one of those who have experienced the effect of this operation. They go to his house and demand such a sum of money—a man as perfectly divested of any feeling of secession as anybody on this floor—and he has no redress, no remedy. In a civil tribunal we have an appeal. But here one single blow, like a flash of lightning, and the man is prostrate at the foot of the military officer, be he who he may, an intelligent man or otherwise, a poor man or otherwise, a savage man or otherwise. There is no redress, no appeal, no exposition before the world of his case.

I ask gentlemen seriously and calmly to divest themselves of this feeling which seems to act upon them. In the name of good sense, in the name of patriotism, and the interest of the country, how can anybody advocate such a principle? If these principles are sound, and if they justify action, why not be consistent? Why come here to-day and insert a proposition as necessary to the interest and well being of the State, and to-morrow violate every word of it?

I hope that sober reflection will enable us to make some disposition of this case, so that we shall not encumber our record with it. I hope that there may not pass down to posterity, on the same page, or within the same book, these inconsistent propositions. I speak from no passion. I have no personal interest—I hope not. I am not within the purview of that resolution. But I do say, as a friend of the law, a friend of the Constitution, a friend of consistency, a friend above all of the citizens of my State, that I hope to see an end of

this matter. I have felt it my duty to express my opinion, meaning no offence to any gentleman personally, and my hope that under this excitement no impulse may prevail which upon sober reflection we would all discard. I hope that the good sense and judgment of this Convention will operate upon a sufficient number of gentlemen at least to have erased from our journal such a proposition as is contained in the resolution adopted yesterday.

Mr. SANDS. I do not propose to enter into an argument or say one word upon the merits of the order adopted yesterday, because this is not the time. That order has been adopted. I rise, however, to suggest to my excellent friend and the Convention, a few of the considerations which induce me to favor and to urge the adoption of that order. I voted, I believe, for each one of those articles in the bill of rights, and I would to God that they had been respected. I ask the gentleman, out of what fact grows this order? Had you, Mr. President, or I, when we voted for these articles in the bill of rights, the slightest idea of ever violating them? Not at all. Who violated them? With whose sympathy and connivance were they violated? Not mine, sir. I utterly repudiate the charge. Our bill of rights did, and always has declared that no man should be seized or despoiled of his liberty and right of personal property without due process of law. Look at the commentary upon this bill of rights which has been written for us, in flame and blood, for the last week or two. And by whom?

Mark you, Mr. President; this order looks to nobody but known rebel sympathizers. Oh, no, sir; you are not to touch life, or limb, or personal property, now, but a day or two ago, when gentlemen were exulting and exclaiming that the rebels were everywhere, then you might take whatever you could lay hand on. It was literally, "touch and go," or rather "touch and come along." It is notorious to the people of the State at large that citizens of Western Maryland were prominent actors in those scenes of violence, and arson, and theft, and every crime that can degrade or disgrace a community. It is at such persons as these that this order aims, and at no innocent man. I would stand up, and I have stood up, for men that I believed innocent, for three or four years, during this terrible struggle. I have stood by them as if they had been my brothers, to protect them, in person and property, whenever assailed, and I would do it again; but as to marauders, I say they have no rights which I respect or am bound to respect.

Something must be done here in Maryland. I say this in perfect kindness to my friends upon the other side. Something must be done in Maryland to verify this people. We must embrace the doctrine that the State having taken a position binds every man in his life and his property to maintain it, or we