

# St. Mary's Gazette.

DEVOTED TO LITERATURE, NEWS, AGRICULTURE, AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

VOL. I.

LEONARD TOWN, MD., THURSDAY MORNING NOVEMBER 19, 1863

NO. 8

## SAINT MARY'S GAZETTE

IS PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY  
WALTER THOMPSON.

**TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.**—\$2.00 per annum, to be paid within six months. No subscription will be received for a shorter period than six months, and no paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid, except at the option of the publisher.

**TERMS OF ADVERTISING.**—\$1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cts. for every subsequent insertion. Eight lines or less constitute a square. If the number of insertions be not marked on the advertisement, it will be published until forbid, and charged accordingly. A liberal deduction made to those who advertise by the year.

### Governor Bradford's Reply to President Lincoln.

*The Difficulty Between the State and the Military Authorities.*

STATE OF MARYLAND,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
ANNAPOLIS, November 3, 1863.

His Excellency, Abraham Lincoln,  
President of the United States.

Sir—Yours of the 2d instant, in reply to mine of the 31st ult., reached me to-day after I had already read it in the Baltimore papers of this morning. Your Excellency has in this respect the advantage of me, for though following your example, I shall send a duplicate of this to the Press, the probabilities are, looking to recent events, that the military authorities will not allow its publication.

When I wrote to you on Saturday last, I had not been able to procure a copy of the military order in reference to the election, and acted merely on the rumors of its character. When I saw it, as I did for the first time on Sunday, I found it even more objectionable than rumor had represented it; and when I was shown on the same day a copy of your letter to Mr. Swann, in which you trust there is "no just ground for the suspicion" he had expressed, and declaring that you felt "mortified that there could be a doubt upon this point of your (his) inquiry," which point was a suggestion by Mr. Swann, "that the election about to take place will be attended with undue interference on the part of persons claiming to represent the wishes of the Government," I rested satisfied that I should receive from you a prompt countermand of the order in question.

If the sending out of one or more regiments of soldiers, distributing them among several of the counties to attend their places of election, in defiance of the known laws of the State prohibiting their presence; ordering military officers and Provost Marshals to arrest voters guilty, in the opinion of such officers, of certain offenses; and menacing Judges of Elections with the power of the military arm in case this military order was not respected, is not an "undue interference" with the freedom of elections, I confess myself unable to imagine what it is. The purpose of your Excellency's remarks, in your letter to me, is confined chiefly to a justification of the exclusion of disloyal voters from the polls by means of the administration of an oath of allegiance. Without stopping to analyze the particular oath in question, it may be sufficient to say that this clause of the order is by far the least objectionable of the three.

If any who were once citizens of the United States have been guilty of such conduct as justly disfranchises them, let them take the consequences. I for one have not interfered and shall not interfere to prevent it. But I insist that the Judges whom the State has provided are the exclusive judges of the question of such citizenship, and that they shall be allowed to exercise their own judgment upon that question, and I shall never cease to protest against any attempt of the military power, in a loyal State, to control that judgment—and especially against the use of any threats tending to coerce an observance by these Judges of any law which such a power shall undertake to prescribe.

The first and third sections of the order are the most remarkable items of the arbitrary authority it assumes. The first places all persons supposed to have given "aid and comfort or encouragement" to persons engaged in the rebellion, and those who "do not recognize their allegiance to the United States," at the mercy of a military officer and Provost Marshal, and orders the latter to arrest them when "approaching the polls," &c., and the third clause intimates to the Judges of Election, in very unmistakable terms, the dangers they incur in case they disobey the military authority. These sworn officers of the law have a new law prescribed to them in this military order, and for disobedience of which they are to be reported to "these headquarters," and must of course, take warning of the consequences that will ensue.

I am aware that your Excellency has so far modified the first of said sections as to substitute for it a direction to these Provost Marshals "to prevent all disturbance or violence about the polls," &c.; and that, in speaking of the terms of the original order, you will admit that "these officers being of necessity the exclusive judges as to who shall be arrested, the provision is liable to abuse;" but I submit, with deference, that whilst this modification may relieve the part of the order of some of the most immoderate of its powers, it still leaves these officers the exclusive judges of who are guilty of violence or disturbance, and, of course, of who are liable to arrest therefor, and leaves them, consequently, the same opportunity for a similar abuse of power, the probability of which you may the more readily estimate when I inform you that several of them are themselves candidates at the same election for some of our most important offices.

You refer several times in your letter to the Missouri case, and to my approval of your course therein, and seem to think that the two States are in the same condition, and have been treated in like manner. Without pausing to compare their conditions, or their respective liability to violence at the polls, I propose to contrast the proceedings which have generally taken place in the two. You say, "My order is Missouri, which you approve, and General Schenck's order here, much precisely the same end." The only action of yours in reference to the Missouri case, of which I have expressed approval, or of which I have any knowledge, is as mentioned in my letter to you, that "disfranchisement in your letter of instructions to Gen. Schofield," bearing date of the 1st of October last, and whether the instructions contained in that letter and Gen. Schenck's order "reached the same end," as you suppose, or not, they certainly proposed to reach it by very different means.

To estimate correctly this difference, we must compare the course respectively taken by the Department Commanders in the two States. General Schofield, in his order of the 28th of September, 1862, and to which I understand you to refer, when in your letter to him, above mentioned, you commenced by saying: "Under your recent order, which I have approved," &c., lays down the following as the military law of Missouri on the subject of election.

"The right," says he, "of the people peaceably to assemble for all lawful purposes, and the right freely to express their will at the polls according to law, are essential to civil liberty. No interference with these rights, either by violence, threats, intimidation, or otherwise will be tolerated."

Again, in the same order he says: "Any officer, soldier or civilian, who shall attempt to intimidate any qualified voter in the exercise of his right to vote, or who shall attempt to prevent any qualified voter from going to the polls or voting, shall be punished by imprisonment or otherwise." &c. If these provisions are compared with the first and third sections of General Schenck's order, the contrast, rather than the similarity, will, I think, be striking.

In your same letter to General Schofield, you further say: "At elections, see that those, and only those, are allowed to vote who are entitled to do so by the laws of Missouri." Not only thus conceding to the State law the right to prescribe the qualification of the voter, but enjoining upon the Military Commander to see that he be allowed to enjoy that right.

Though your Excellency refers to the difference in the qualification required of voters, in the two States, I can hardly suppose, especially in view of the unqualified and emphatic terms in which you recognize the control of the State laws, that you mean to place that recognition upon the ground that you approve the laws of one State and not of the other; and, besides, I think, you might be allowed some benefit of the consideration that Missouri, which they have recently had a Constitutional Convention, which enabled them to remodel their laws on the subject of the elective franchise—an opportunity we have not yet enjoyed, and which is necessary for the purpose of such modification, though such necessity might possibly be dispensed with hereafter, in view of the new power which Military Commanders claim to exercise in the premises.

The conclusion of your Excellency's letter makes an allusion to past precedents in Maryland, and is evidently designed to make the point that I should be the last to complain of such an order, as it is, as you say, "precisely what General Dix did" when I was elected Governor.

If such was the case, the proceeding at least does not seem to have been very effective in reducing the vote of the State, 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 General 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 by 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 active with the determination to carry out their purpose.

Under these circumstances, what was the order issued by General Dix? It was issued on the 1st November, 1862, 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 General 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 been applied to the proper residents of the State, but only to returning Rebels; and so far from being "precisely" what General 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 upon 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 placed 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.

### THE TRIBUNE'S "CLOSE UP."

The Tribune calls upon "the freemen of our State about to deposit the ballots which embody their verdict on the political issues of the day, to cast a glance Southward to Baltimore and note the significance and the moral of the spectacle there presented." Most opportune. We echo the suggestion of the Tribune, and can conceive no better argument to the Democracy, to record their verdict against the dominant party than that glowing "spectacle" of a great city of the Republic, bound in moral chains and helpless in the presence of Federal bayonets. We, too, call upon the freemen of the State, to cast a glance Southward to Baltimore, and dwell with all the intensity of their mental vision upon the condition of her citizens, and freemen too, now stripped of their liberties and restrained from the exercise of the privileges of citizenship, by a stern and arrogant military despotism. There is a latent sarcasm in our contemporary's invitation to the voters of New York. It cannot seriously mean to parade the poor, dumb, and passive Maryland as an object of political beauty to be envied and emulated by the Empire State. It means more like, exulting in the way of fanaticism, to foreshadow the enslavement that will succeed a Black Republican triumph, and to taunt our citizens prematurely with a premonition of their doom. We too point to Baltimore, not as an example, but as a warning.

The Tribune says: "When the Unionists of the slave States—those who never were Republicans, but voted in '60 for Bull, Breckinridge or Douglas—tell you that the Union can only be saved by emancipation, why should you hesitate?" The people of Maryland have not proclaimed in favor of emancipation. Had their popular sentiment the opportunity of expression, it would denounce the policy. Maryland has no voter she is under a military dictatorship, and her soil swarms with spies, informers, and armed men.

The assembly whose hithering cheeks responded to Mr. Chase's declaration, that "Union and Emancipation are henceforth one and inseparable," was composed of the retainers of the Administration—the sycophants, the parasites, the plant clients of the Federal power. For several years preceding the Presidential election, the City of Baltimore was disgraced by the ascendancy of an organization of desperate men. The respectable community, without reference to party distinction, made an extraordinary effort, supported by the Legislature of the State, and reduced the

successful way. In this case, the most emancipation leaders were the most successful. The police force were the most thoroughly reconstructed and retrained. The elements of the old organization of Administration, without principle, without honor, and seeking no better end than the preservation of their own position. They are the men who cheer so lustily the Abolition declamations of Cabinet orators, and who are indicated by The Tribune as the people of Baltimore, and models for the freemen of New York.

Let the chains fall from Maryland, and her disenthralled people will soon refute the charge that they approve the pernicious policy of Emancipation. The Tribune's statement of facts illustrates the absurdity of its logic. "That is the city," it says of Baltimore, "which in 1860 gave nineteen thousand and sixty-three votes for the pro-slavery candidates for President, and only one thousand and eighty-three for Lincoln, while the whole State gave Lincoln but two thousand and ninety-four votes to ninety thousand and six hundred and eight for his three pro-slavery antagonists." And now the Tribune claims that the State and City endorse the Abolition doctrine. Is it not patent to the commonest understanding that this extraordinary revision of sentiment is an impossibility? Hate the people of Maryland, in the space of three years, passed from almost unanimity, in a certain political direction, to an antipathetic sentiment? The figures quoted, when taken in connection with any emancipation majority that may occur, prove that arbitrary power has silenced the popular voice, and that the people of Maryland have lost their elective franchise and are either politically dumb or obedient to military dictation.—*New York Daily News.*

### THE NEW YORK PRESS ON THE ELECTION.

*From the New York Tribune.*

Let us, then, all agree in this as one point settled. The people may or may not approve arbitrary arrests; they may or may not approve the general conduct of the war for the Union; they may and may not believe that, in order that the Union may be truly and conclusively restored, slavery will have to die; and they certainly do hold that the Union must and shall be preserved, even though to this end it should be necessary to hurt the feelings of traitors and rebels. They won't intend to creep in at the back door of the rebel Confederacy; they don't mean to coax or buy the return of the Nation's prodigal sons; but they do mean that the Federal Republic founded by Washington and his compatriots shall be upheld, and that not a stripe nor star shall be erased from its banner. Let us, then, consider this point settled, and cast about for the means of giving steadily and certain effect to the public will. And if any of the States which are now under the military power of the rebellion wish for peace, let them be assured that it can only and at any moment be secured by submission to the Constitution, laws and rightful authorities of our common country.

*From the Herald.*

\* \* \* Last year the people pronounced against that radical abolition policy which would make the restoration of the Union dependent upon the extinction of Southern slavery. This year the people have as decisively pronounced against the demoralizing copperhead faction, which would purchase peace at the price of a degrading and ruinous submission to Jeff. Davis. The people, adhering to the war for the Union, have rejected both these disturbing factions, and it is the duty and the only safe policy of the President to follow these unmistakable manifestations of public opinion.

*From the Times.*

The enlightened law-respecting public opinion of the State—that element of society which carries moral power with it—has declared itself against the Governor and for the President with a preponderance that ought to confound every decent man among the Governor's adherents. It is equivalent to a solemn finding that he stands opposed to the patriotic sentiments and moral convictions of the Commonwealth, and he is derided in the day that tries men's souls.

*From the News.*

Now, men of absolute power, you have full sway, what blessing or what curse have you in store for an enthralled people? Your wealth, duplicity and power have conquered the North at the ballot-box, let us see if you have equal fortune with the armed South. You are at the same of your political strength, though not of your aspirations. Next comes the inevitable reaction, and with it the downfall of the dynasty you have raised upon the ruins of constitutional liberty. Your usurped authority is at its zenith; henceforward your path is the downward grade, until you reach the verge of the political precipice, and topple over into impotence and obscurity.

### THE LATE COMMANDER OF THE ARMY OF THE CUMBERLAND.

The *New York Courier des Etats Unis* remarks as follows, on the authority of a Cincinnati correspondent, in reference to General Rosecrans' views of the Administration and its policy:

Persons who are on intimate terms with General Rosecrans declare that he is greatly disappointed in the war. This is not because he considers the Southern armies invincible, but because he believes that the seceded States can never be brought back by the rigorous policy which the Government has adopted. He has never taken any part in the proceedings of Andrew Johnson, the Military Governor of Tennessee, who has succeeded in converting to secession all people who had any hopes of the Union. Himself perfectly disinterested, he looks with disgust upon the shameful traffic which is going on under the mask of patriotism. When he looks around him he sees men moved by all sorts of motives, more or less decent, except honor and love of country. Some are fighting from ambition, others from avarice; to the latter the conquest of the country means only pillage and cheap cotton; the former are jealous of their superiors and their equals, and are delighted with any reverse which may overtake them.

Profoundly honest and religious, Rosecrans regards these spectacles with bitter aversion. His religious feelings have grown upon him in proportion to the excesses and intrigues which he is impelled to prevent, and in mystical hopes of another world he seeks relief from the corruptions of the present. He no longer fights with any ardor, not simply from a sense of duty, considering each victory a useless waste of blood. He has no confidence in his successors, considering that they are followed by the army of birds of prey, whose rapacity makes hopeless the pacification of the country.

All these details come to me from a person very dear to Rosecrans, to whom the general wrote that he saw in the defeat of Chickamauga, the finger of God.

### Forrest, Wharton and Wheeler.

The correspondent of the *Chicago Journal* dashes off the Confederate cavalry leaders in this style:

"Of Forrest, the men of Straight's raid, whose prisoners they were, have made your readers familiar. A strange mingling of small portions of Chesterfield and Cagliostro, of generosity and heartlessness, seem to have gone to make him up. We have heard of his giving money to penniless prisoners with one hand, while he robbed them by the acts of his subordinates, with the other."

"Of Wheeler and Wharton, possibly they may know less. The former is a graduate of West Point, and so small in stature as to have worn the name of Point Wheeler, a sharp way of intimating that, in his case, physical humanity had been whittled mercilessly down just next to nothing. Quick of intellect, affable in manner, frank and winning of bearing, he is a good leader in a bad cause. Wharton is a lawyer, of Houston, Texas, and led the famed Texas Rangers before Texas grew rampant; many of whom still belong to his command—brave, dashing fellows, a large number of them graduates of Northern colleges, and, as I am assured by an officer whose fortune it was to be their prisoner, kind and courteous to captives, and actually discussing poetry, geology, and the classics while riding like Tam O'Shanter, with music before and Mitchell behind."

"It is said, you know, and I think the criticism has a grain of justice, that Milton so humanized his head devil in the diabolical state council as to make us have a 'fellow feeling' for him, and so degraded him into a statesman, that Webster or Pitt might have sat for the picture. Take the passage and try it. Now all I have to say about Forrest, Wharton and Wheeler is, that they must belong to the Miltonian fraternity of right gentlemanly sort of devils—don't you think so?"

### GENERAL MORGAN.

The *Montgomery Daily Advertiser* publishes the life and military achievements of the renowned General John H. Morgan, now a prisoner, with head shaved and pica-dilly garments, in the penitentiary of Ohio. An extract from the article in question, which we subjoin, recapitulates all the grand exploits of this Southern Paladin. No man of his day can accomplish more, if so much, and the summing up shows an array of glorious deeds that were never surpassed in number and brilliancy. The writer says:

Morgan's career may be summed up with truth as follows: He has fought sixty-three battles, and has been successful in fifty-seven; took 30,000 prisoners, killed 20,000, and destroyed \$50,000,000 worth of property, and taken 50,000 stands of small arms, and fifty pieces of artillery, 20,000 horses, and traveled 12,000 miles. The figures surpass anything in the annals of history, and he has not had with him at any time over 5,000 men for duty. *Richmond Dispatch, Oct. 31.*

### A FRANK ADMISION.

Billy Rose is a great temperance lecturer, and at Rushville, Illinois, was preaching to the young on his favorite theme.—He said:

"Now, boys, when I ask you a question you must not be afraid to speak right out and answer me. When you look around and see all these fine houses, farms, and cattle, do you ever think who owns them all? Your fathers own them, do they not?"

"Yes, sir," shouted a hundred voices.

"Well, where will your fathers be in twenty years from now?"

"Dead," shouted the boys.

"That's right. And who will own the property then?"

"Us boys."

"Right. Now tell me—did you ever go in along the streets, notice the drunkards, lounging around the saloon doors waiting for somebody to treat them?"

"Yes, sir, lots of them."

"Well, where will they be in twenty years from now?"

"Dead."

"And who will be the drunkards then?"

"Us boys."

Billy was thunderstruck for a moment; but recovering himself, endeavored to tell them how to escape such a fate.

A "FRANK GENTLEMAN'S OPINION."—A Paris correspondent states that a French gentleman who came passenger in the China, has visited Chattanooga, Charleston and Richmond since the defeat of Rosecrans. The accounts he brings of the general condition of things in the South are exceedingly encouraging to the Rebel cause. He says Bragg's army "is the largest and finest body of men in the world," that "Charleston is impregnable," and "Richmond jubilant." This gentleman, Count —, passed through New York, and represents the people of Gotham as "utterly blind to disgraceable facts," and says that "they will believe nothing that is not favorable to the unholy work of subjugation."

The New Congress.—The first session of the new Congress commences three weeks from next Monday. The Senate will have a very large republican majority. The House, according to the latest accounts, adding the Maryland members just elected, and conceding the entire Kentucky delegation to the opposition, will stand. Administration members 97; opposition 87.—A member is to be elected in Delaware on Tuesday next.—*Boston Traveller.*

Good Shooting.—The color bearer of the Tenth Tennessee, (Irish,) having been shot down in the battle of Chickamauga, the Colonel ordered one of the privates to take the colors. Pat, who was leading at the time, replied: "By St. Patrick, Colonel, there's so much good shooting here I haven't a minute's time to waste fooling with that thing."

"I have always been astonished," said Mrs. Smith, "at the anxiety of young ladies for beaux, but I never picked a female more than when Miss Mountflathers left my school. Seeing her gazing toward the sky, I asked her what she was looking for?"

"That beau," she said, "which is told of in Genesis, as being set in the cloud, I wish he'd come down."

A COCK LEG FOR GENERAL HOOD.—The Atlanta *Confederate*, says that as soon as General Hood was pronounced convalescent, that portion of his old brigade which still remains with him immediately raised by subscription, \$2,140, for the purchase of a cock leg for him.

An Eastern editor is responsible for the following illustrations of juvenile piety: "Pony told, bless father and mother and Anna. By jinks I must scurry quick to get into bed before Mary does."

What are you drunk again? No my dear, not drunk, but a little slippery. The fact is, my dear, some scoundrel has been rubbing my boots till they are as smooth as a pane of glass."

"Oh, father!" exclaimed a delighted youngster, "I've dithered through addition, partition, subtraction, distraction, abomination, justification, hallucination, damnation, and amputation."

A wicked editor says that at church some people sometimes clasp their hands so closely in prayer time that they are unable to get them open when the contribution box comes round.

The timber in the glass fire-bracket which a man often puts when his soul is on fire, but it increases the conflagration.

Moving for a new trial.—Courting a second wife.

Prof. Haller, the well-known ventriloquist and mesmerizer, died in Harrisburg, Pa., on Sunday.