

THE SUBMISSIONISTS & THEIR RECORD.

THE DODGES OF MR. PENDLETON,

CHICAGO CANDIDATE FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

[From the *Evening Post* of Oct. 6, 1864.]

THE McClellan journals have made a discovery about Mr. Pendleton. They triumphantly assure the public that he did not vote against several decided war measures. This is true; but neither did he vote *for* them; he “dodged.” That is to say, he ran into the cloak-room or walked out of the chamber when the clerk began to call the roll, and remained away until the vote was decided.

He was the most notorious “dodger” in the House; and earned the reputation there of keeping such a constant eye upon the means of speedy retreat to the cloak-room, that there was not the slightest danger of his communications with this base being cut or interrupted. We have already given a pretty full summary of his votes, with passages from his disunion speeches. We had not space, at that time, to mention also the occasions when he “dodged.” A few of these we present below to-day. It will be seen that the cloak-room of the House of Representatives was as useful to Mr. Pendleton as the gunboat *Galena* was to his colleague on the Chicago ticket, General McClellan.

July 15, 1861, Mr. McClernand offered a preamble and resolution declaring the rebellion “in violation of constitutional obligations,” and pledging the House of Representatives to vote the required money and men “to ensure a speedy and effectual suppression of such rebellion.” Only five members voted against this resolution. *Mr. Pendleton dodged.* His name appears in the proceedings of the House, in the *Globe*, but a few lines above the record of this vote.

We pass over several instances, and come to December 17, 1863, when Mr. Green Clay Smith, of Kentucky, offered a resolution:

“That we hold it to be the duty of Congress to pass all necessary bills to supply men and money, and the duty of the people to render every aid in their power to the constituted authorities of the Government in crushing out the rebellion, and in bringing the leaders thereof to condign punishment.”

But one member, Mr. Harris, of Maryland, voted against this. *Mr. Pendleton dodged.* He was in the House, and voted against another resolution with the following preamble:

“Whereas, The organized treason, having its headquarters at Richmond, exists in defiant violation of the National Constitution, and has no claim to be treated otherwise than as an outlaw; and whereas this Richmond combination of conspirators and traitors can have no rightful authority over the people of any portion of the National Union, and no warrant for assuming control of the political destiny of the people of any State or section of the Union, and no apology but that of conspiracy and treason for any assumption of authority whatever.”

This preamble was voted on separately, and was adopted unanimously. That is to say, all who voted, said “yea.” *Mr. Pendleton dodged*, as did also Cox, the Woods and Ancona.

January 18, 1864, Mr. Smith, of Kentucky, submitted a preamble and resolution:

“Whereas, A most desperate, wicked, and bloody rebellion exists within the jurisdiction of the United States, and the safety and security of personal and national liberty depend upon its absolute and utter extinction; therefore,

“Resolved, That it is the political, civil, moral, and sacred duty of the people to meet it, fight it, crush it, and forever destroy it.”

Mr. James C. Allen tried to “kill” this resolution by a motion to lay it on the table. This failed, though Mr. Pendleton, who for some reason did not dodge, was one of the twenty-six (against one hundred and two), who voted with Mr. Allen. The preamble and resolution were then adopted, yeas one hundred and sixteen, nays sixteen, and Mr. Pendleton did *not* dodge, but voted against it.

But on February 29th, 1864, Mr. Sehenek submitted several resolutions. The second was in the following words:

“Resolved, That this rebellion shall be effectually put down; and that, to prevent the recurrence of such rebellions in future, the causes which led to this one must be permanently removed.”

When the second clause in this sentence came up, it was adopted by yeas one hundred and twenty-four, nays none. *Mr. Pendleton dodged.*

The vote was next taken on the last of Mr. Schenck's resolutions :

“Resolved, That in this struggle which is going on for the saving of our country and free government, there is no middle ground on which any good citizen or true patriot can stand ; neutrality or indifference or anything short of a hearty support of the government being a crime where the question is between loyalty and treason.”

This was adopted, yeas one hundred and nine, nays none. Even Mr. Cox voted for it. *Mr. Pendleton dodged.*

We have not space or time to-day to cite any other cases where Mr. Pendleton dodged ; but it may be useful to notice a few of the occasions when he did not dodge. July 10th, 1861, he voted with only ten others, amongst them Vallandigham and Wood, against the bill for collecting revenue in the seceded States. July 18th, he voted against the bill providing “increased revenue from imports” for war purposes. July 29th, he voted against another war revenue bill.

April 8th, 1862, he was one of fifteen who voted against the bill to provide internal revenue, support the government, and pay the interest on the public debt. May 28th, he was one of eighteen who voted against the bill to impose taxes in the insurrectionary districts, thus consistently defending the justice and right of secession. June 28th, he was one of ten who voted against the Tax bill. July 15th, he voted against the reduction of the mileage of members, showing himself thus averse to economy. April 9th, 1864, he voted against the expulsion of Harris, of Maryland for saying on the floor of the House :

“The South asked you to let them live in peace. But no ; you said you would bring them into subjection. That is not done yet ; and God Almighty grant that it never may be. I hope that you will never subjugate the South.”

April 14th, he voted against the censure of Mr. Long for similar remarks. June 13th, he voted against the Army Appropriation Bill, as finally agreed upon by Committees of Conference of both Houses.

Finally, we find Mr. Pendleton asserting in the House of Representatives, on January 18, 1861, when South Carolina and three Gulf States had just adopted secession ordinances, that the

government of the United States can constitutionally recognize secession, and assist in its own destruction. Mr. Stanton said :

“I would be glad to know of my colleague if he holds that there is any power in any department of this government to recognize the secession of a State under the constitution? As to the matter of conciliation and compromise, the people of the seceding States say they want none and will accept none; and therefore it is useless to talk of it. I again ask my colleague whether there is any power, under the constitution, to recognize the secession of a State, and recognize it as a foreign nation?”

Mr. Pendleton replied :

“What may be the constitutional power of this government to recognize the secession of a State, I decline to discuss at present. But this I say, if we should become engaged in a war with a foreign enemy, and a portion of our territory should be captured and reduced to possession by the enemy, and we should be obliged to make a treaty of peace on the basis of retaining what each party had acquired—*uti possidetis*—acknowledging the sovereignty of that territory to have passed away from us, certainly the federal government would have the power to conform to our restricted limits and to confine its jurisdiction to our admitted boundaries. If war be dismemberment, as my colleague declares, has not the federal government as much power to treat that question now as at the end of a war? Will a conflict of arms confer constitutional power upon the federal government?”

In the same speech he said :

“If these southern states cannot be conciliated, and if you, gentlemen, cannot find it in your hearts to grant their demands; if they must leave the family mansion, I would signalize their departure by tokens of love.”

SHORT BUT EFFECTIVE SPEECH OF MR. PENDLETON.

On January 9th, 1863, Mr. Dunn rose in the House of Representatives and said :

“I ask the unanimous consent of the House for leave to introduce a bill to facilitate the transportation of troops, stores, and the mails of the United States between the city of Washington, Point of Rocks, and the city of Pittsburg.”

Mr. Pendleton rose and said: “I object.”

Objection being made the bill had to lie over

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

No. 65.—Part 2.

THE SUBMISSIONISTS AND THEIR RECORD.

What a Copperhead Mayor says of our Victories.

MAYOR'S OFFICE, NEW YORK, SEPT. 29, 1864.

To the Honorable the Common Council :

GENTLEMEN: Your resolution of the 26th instant, appointing a "committee of five from each Board, for the purpose of making the necessary arrangements to cause the various public buildings to be illuminated in honor of the recent victories on land and sea," is returned unapproved.

I might acquiesce in your response to an appeal of your fellow-citizens, who might desire to give expression to their feelings respecting these victories, but I must decline to comply with your request to issue a proclamation to the citizens generally, to join in such an illumination, for various reasons, which I will briefly state.

1. If I should issue such a proclamation, *there are many citizens who would be denounced as disloyal*, if through want of opportunity or inclination, or of means, they failed to comply with the recommendation.

2. By those in authority, *they are not claimed as Union victories*, but as the result of the Emancipation Proclamations, and latest war measure of President Lincoln, as announced in his "To whom it may concern" manifesto.

3. It is asserted that the new policy of the Administration will *give us a succession of victories*. If this is the case your honorable body will be called upon to illuminate every fortnight, and if the papers in the employ of the Administration, who daily parade "the defeat of the rebels," are to be believed, three times a week.

I yield to no man in my attachment to "the Union as it was and the Constitution as it is," but as the President demands of the Southern people to abandon the rights which the Constitution confers, I do not see how those who have always held that the Federal Government has nothing to do with the domestic institutions of the States, can be expected to rejoice over *victories which, whatever they may be, surely are not Union victories.*

If those victories were to unite the States, and were a sure harbinger of peace, I would be pleased, if I could issue such a proclamation as would induce the poorest citizen to part with his last mite for the purchase of a single tallow candle to celebrate the event.

4. It has been the immemorial custom of mankind, in all ages and climes, *to abstain from rejoicing over victories gained in civil wars*, and such has been the practice thus far during the present strife, which has distracted our once happy Union. The only effect of departing from this usage, sanctioned alike by humanity and sound policy, will be to acknowledge, by such exhibitions that these are victories over aliens and enemies, and that there is no hope of securing peace on the basis of the Federal Union. This hope, in common with a large portion of our fellow-citizens, I am not prepared to abandon.

You are aware that here is the essential difference between the two parties now contending for political mastery in the Northern States; one of these declares that no terms can be offered "except such as may be based upon an unconditional surrender" of the rights of the States, and the other maintains that "peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union."

Taking into consideration that a canvass is now in progress of the most exciting character, I am forced to regard *the proposed demonstration as one of a political nature*, and, according to the rule which I laid down for my guidance on entering upon the duties of Mayor, I cannot give it my official indorsement.

C. GODFREY GUNTHER, *Mayor.*

There's the document! It sets forth more tersely and justly than anything else we have seen, the real temper and spirit of the party which demands "immediate efforts for a *cessation of hostilities.*" The Mayor is afraid to rejoice over victories lest those who won't rejoice should be suspected of disloyalty. He is fearful, if we begin this business, we shall have to rejoice over fresh victories "three times a week!" And to cap the climax, these are *not* Union victories at all, but—something else. Will not Mayor Gunther bring his great intellectual powers to bear

on the question once more and tell us what they are? They certainly are not *rebel* victories. They can scarcely be claimed as *Democratic* victories. If they are not Union victories, pray what are they?

We are sorry we cannot comfort the Mayor or his party with hopes of their "cessation." Their demand for a "cessation of hostilities" has not yet been indorsed by the American people and until it is, we fear the Mayor's political reveries will continue to be disturbed by Union victories and public rejoicings.

Whatever else he may or may not be, Mayor Gunther, is a "Democrat" in the party acceptation of the word. His orthodoxy has never been disputed or doubted. He is and always has been in good and regular standing. The party elected him, not so much on account of his splendid talents or of his brilliant personal qualities of any sort, as because he was known to be a genuine, unmistakeable, unadulterated disciple of the modern Democracy. They have made him Mayor, and naturally enough he now feels bound to represent their principles and carry out their views.

When the Common Council, therefore, yielded so far to outside pressure as to urge a public illumination on account of our victories, Mayor Gunther promptly squelched this unseemly departure from party principles and gave these gentlemen to understand that he should tolerate no such proceedings. He believes in the Chicago platform,—and that standard of the faith does not allow rejoicings over victories in an unjust and unholy war.

The Mayor's exposition of this subject is so clear and compact a statement of the sentiments and purposes of his party, that it ought to be widely circulated, and universally read. The National Committee appointed at Chicago ought to issue it as a campaign document and spread it broadcast over the country. They have been a little remiss, it is true, in not publishing their platform in this shape:—but they can make up for this by issuing the two together. Meantime we will give the Mayor's message the benefit of an additional insertion in our columns.



What Mr. Pendleton thinks of Coercion.

Extract from Speech of January 18, 1861.

"Now, Sir, what force of arms can compel a State to do that which she has agreed to do? What force of arms can compel a State to refrain from doing that which her State Government,

supported by the sentiment of her people, is determined to persist in doing? It is provided in the Constitution that the citizens of every State shall have all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States. What force of this Federal Government can compel the observance of that clause, if a State is determined to pass and execute laws whereby citizens of other States shall not have within its limits, the same privileges as its own citizens?

“‘Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts and judicial proceedings of every other State.’ How will the Federal Government, by armies and arms, enforce the observance of that clause in the Constitution, if the judiciary and the executive authorities of a State, supported by the laws, refuse such faith and credit.?

“‘No State, without the consent of Congress, shall lay any imposts or duties on imports.’ Suppose a State should pass such a law, and the citizens were willing to execute the law, what army could prevent it?

“‘No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with a foreign Power.’ I wish to know from gentlemen what number of men it would require to annul such an agreement, once made. The General Government is invested with certain powers, necessary to be executed, in order to keep the machinery of the Government in motion. Can any number of troops, or the use of any armed force on the part of the States, compel the General Government to execute those powers, if the agents appointed for that purpose deliberately, persistently refuse to execute them? *Sir, the whole scheme of coercion is impracticable. It is contrary to the genius and spirit of the Constitution.*”



Loyal Leagues, Clubs or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.

