

# BELLEFONTE PATRIOT.

BELLEFONTE, CENTRE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, PRINTED BY THOMAS J. PETRIKIN.

Vol. VII.

SATURDAY, August 21, 1824.

No. 38

## Crawford Convention.

THE delegates appointed in the several counties of this state friendly to the nomination for President and Vice President of the United States, made in caucus by the national representatives, at Washington, on the 14th of February, 1824, for the purpose of nominating electors for the ensuing presidential election, having convened at the court house in Harrisburg, on the 9th of August inst. proceeded to organize themselves by the appointment of

**MATTHEW ROBERTS**, of Montgomery county, President, and  
**EPHRAIM PENTLAND**, Esq. of Pittsburg, and **DAVID F. GORDON**, Esq. of Philadelphia, Secretaries.

A committee being appointed to examine the credentials of delegates, it was found that the following persons were present as delegates from the following counties respectively, viz.

*Philadelphia City*—Josiah Randall, D. F. Gordon, Major S. H. Perkins, Col. Joseph Strahan, Joseph Diver, Lambert Keating.

*Philadelphia County*—James M'Ewen, Capt David Hardie, Joseph P. Le Clerc, Col. James Dyer, John Johnson, John R. Jones.

*Montgomery*—Matthew Roberts, Stephen Porter, Major James White, John M'Nair, jr.  
*Chester*—John Roberts, Jacob Neiler, John Wells, John Workhizer.

*Delaware*—John Worthington.

*Lancaster*—George C. Lloyd, Lewis Wislar.

*Northumberland*—David Tweed, William A. Lloyd.

*Columbia*—Stephen Baldy.

*Allegheny*—Ephraim Pentland, Robert Burke.

*Mercer*—David Leech.

*Beaver*—William Cairns.

And that communications from several counties had been received, recommending suitable persons to be supported for electors.

A committee consisting of Ephraim Pentland, Samuel H. Perkins, Matthew Roberts, Jacob Neiler, Lewis Wislar, James M'Ewen and Wm. A. Lloyd, having been appointed, to nominate electors and report such measures as were expedient for this convention to adopt, reported the following resolutions and address, which were unanimously adopted:

*Resolved*, That the system of nominating the democratic candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, by the democratic members of congress, assembled in caucus, heretofore pursued with such signal and uniform success, meets the decided approbation of this convention.

*Resolved*, That this convention recognize in **WILLIAM H. CRAWFORD** of Georgia, who was placed in nomination for the office of President of the United States, by the caucus of republican members of congress, lately assembled in Washington city, a statesman whose elevated talents, long experience and pure principles eminently qualify him for the faithful and able discharge of the arduous duties of that distinguished station, and decidedly merit for him the warm and unanimous support of the democracy of Pennsylvania.

*Resolved*, That the splendid abilities, the distinguished services and well tried patriotism and republicanism of our fellow citizen **ALBERT GALLATIN**, procure for his nomination, as the democratic candidate for the Vice Presidency of the United States, the unequivocal approbation of this convention.

*Resolved*, That the following persons compose the democratic republican electoral ticket, in Pennsylvania, favorable to the national nomination of William H. Crawford for President, and Albert Gallatin for Vice President.

- |                   |                     |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| Richard Rush,     | Alexander L. Hays,  |
| Samuel Witherill, | Anthony Taylor,     |
| John Geyer,       | William Watts,      |
| John Connelly,    | John Hannah,        |
| Samuel Casor,     | Henry W. Snyder,    |
| Enoch Abrahams,   | George Dennison,    |
| David Wilson,     | Walter Franklin jr. |
| John Light,       | William M'Kinstry,  |
| Christian Snyder, | John Mullan,        |
| Jacob Goodheart,  | Henry Black,        |
| John Walter,      | Isaac Griffin,      |
| Abel M'Farland,   | Francis M'Clure,    |
| John Negley,      | Philip Mechling,    |
| John A. Scroggs,  | James Montgomery.   |

*Resolved*, That the democratic citizens, friendly to the national nomination, be requested to meet in their respective counties, and to appoint committees of correspondence to confer with their democratic brethren on the subject of the presidential election.

*Resolved*, That the committee of correspondence at Philadelphia consist of Jacob Sommer, C. J. Ingersoll, Manuel Eyre, Horatio G. Jones, Samuel Badger, Thomas F. Gordon and Josiah Randall.

*Resolved*, That the committee of correspondence at Pittsburg consist of James Riddle, Charles Shaler, William Courtney, John B. Butler, Robert Christy, William M'Candless and Ephraim Pentland.

*Resolved*, That the said committees be authorized to address the respective individuals, designated on the electoral ticket, and ascertain whether they are willing to permit their names to remain on the said ticket, and in case of any vacancy, by resignation or otherwise, that they

be authorized to take the proper measures to fill the same.

Mr. Randall, of Philadelphia, after expressing his high sense of the respectful manner in which this convention have been treated by the people of Harrisburg assembled to witness its deliberations, and the facilities afforded to it in the course of its proceedings, offered the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted.

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this meeting be presented to the commissioners of Dauphin county for the use of the court house.

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this meeting be presented to C. Gleim, Esq. sheriff of the said county, for the politeness and attention with which this meeting have been treated during their session.

*Resolved*, That the proceedings of this convention be published in the "Pennsylvania Intelligencer," and that the editors of all other democratic republican newspapers of the state be requested to republish the same.

**MATTHEW ROBERTS, Pres't.**

*Attest*  
**DAVID F. GORDON,** } Secretaries.  
**E. PENTLAND,** }

## ADDRESS

To the Democratic Citizens of Pennsylvania.

FELLOW CITIZENS—

HAVING executed the business for which we were more immediately delegated, we should feel that we had but imperfectly performed our duty, if we did not freely commune with you on the probable effects on Pennsylvania politics, likely to result from an abandonment by the democratic party, of ancient usages and modes, which have always been successful and have always resulted in honor and advantage to the nation. Before we enter upon the discharge of this duty, it may be well briefly to notice some points in an address which emanated from, although never sanctioned by, a democratic convention which assembled at this place, on the 4th of March last. The observations we shall make, shall be wholly to correct facts and not with any intention to animadvert upon the ignorance or misrepresentation of the committee whose names are subscribed to the address, much less to reflect upon the convention by whom they were appointed.—What we write shall be in a spirit of candor, from the purest motives and the deepest convictions that the times and the best interests of our country, our party and principle require, and we respectfully, yet earnestly request it may be read in the same spirit and with the same feelings.

They complain, heavily of the congressional caucus held at Washington, February 14, 1824, and advance some assertions in relation to it, which a regard to truth impels us to correct. They say "it was held in utter disregard and defiance of the known wishes of the democratic party in congress and throughout the union." As this assertion is not attempted to be supported, even by the shadow of evidence, and as it is indeed altogether unsupported by fact, we shall pass it by, with a simple denial of its truth, and examine some passages of still more importance, and which are labored with much anxiety. They are embraced in the following extracts.

"A congressional caucus could never be defensible but as the echo of the voice of the great republican party of the union. It has hitherto consisted of a large majority of the friends of all the candidates entering into caucus and surrendering their personal predilections on the altar of republican ascendancy. But the late unprecedented assemblage was holden in direct hostility with every usage and principle of the democratic party." "Such a meeting of the friends of an individual might distract and divide but could not harmonize and unite the democratic party."

We shall show that most of these assertions are groundless: the facts we submit shall be of such notoriety and so easily supported by documents, that they must carry conviction to every mind, which will take the trouble to examine the subject. The more it is examined the more perfect and entire will be the conviction that the congressional caucus of 1824 was holden not "in direct hostility to every usage and principle," but in exact conformity to all the usages and principles "of the democratic party."

The caucus of 1824 was called by a public and general notice, signed and put up in the usual manner and at the usual places; all the democratic members of congress were invited to assemble publicly in the hall of the House of Representatives, and proceed, as heretofore to select candidates for the office of President and Vice president of the United States. This was in strict conformity to "every usage and principle" heretofore adopted by the democratic party. If the caucus was not more numerously attended, that was surely not the fault of those who did attend, whatever blame may attach itself to those who declined "surrendering their personal predilections on the altar of republican ascendancy." There were this year, for the first time, five candidates for the presidency, and the friends of no one of the five, but those of Mr. Crawford, were willing to curb their ambition and submit their claims, as had always before been done, to a meeting of the republican members of Congress. The question which necessarily presents itself, on this

state of things is, who were most praiseworthy, who most anxious to concentrate the strength of the democratic party, those who declined, or those who submitted, to the accustomed arbitrament of the party? The answer to this question determines that William H. Crawford is on party principles, pre-eminently entitled to the support of that party whose usages and principles, he, alone, has held sacred.

How far it is correct to aver that congressional caucusses "have hitherto consisted of a large majority of the democratic members of congress, composed of the friends of all the candidates" can easily be tested by the following facts, connected with congressional nominations. May 10, 1800, Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr, were unanimously nominated; 46 members of Congress attended the caucus. January 23, 1803, James Madison was nominated, 89 members attended the caucus, 83 voted for Mr. Madison. May 13, 1812, James Madison was unanimously nominated, 82 members present.— March 16, 1816, James Monroe was nominated, 119 members attended the caucus, 65 voted for James Monroe and 54 for Wm. H. Crawford, who had, with rare magnanimity, repeatedly refused to stand a candidate in opposition to Mr. Monroe, who had been longer before the public as a candidate than Mr. Crawford. If any of the present candidates had been moved by the same high, honorable & well principled considerations which governed Mr. Crawford, we should not now see the democratic party as it is, some for and some against the national nomination. February 14, 1824, William H. Crawford was nominated, 68 members in the caucus, 64 voted for Mr. Crawford, and from 30 to 50 members, his political friends, declined to go into caucus, from various causes not to be enumerated.

From the above statement of facts it appears, I. That five congressional caucusses have been held:

II. That less than 80 has been the average number of members attending.

III. That in all these caucusses but one, the members attending were the friends of the candidate selected and elected.

IV. That until this year, there never were more than two candidates under consideration.

V. That the candidates thus selected for more than 20 years have been uniformly successful.

From these facts it is apparent,

I. That an experience of 24 years has proved the efficacy and invariable success of congressional caucusses.

II. That they have uniformly tended to harmonize and unite the democratic party.

III. That considering the great number and influence of the candidates before the public, the congressional caucus this year was as large as could reasonably be expected and proportionally larger than any former one.

IV. That the assertions that all caucusses hitherto held "consisted of a large majority of the democratic members of congress," is an error, as is also the assertion that they were composed of the friends of all the other candidates entering into caucus." These facts and deductions are submitted without a single remark; their own intrinsic weight and direct bearing upon the question, will secure them that portion of public attention which in our estimation their importance require.

As it does not appear that more than two candidates for the presidency, Andrew Jackson and William H. Crawford, are before the people of Pennsylvania, in such a manner as to concentrate their opinions at the poll, we shall confine our observations to these gentlemen.

Towards general Jackson we have no feeling so strong as gratitude, and we shall from regard to our own feeling, treat his character, conduct and pretensions with all possible decorum, delicacy and reserve. His glory, and that of his country were greatly diffused abroad by the signal defeat of the enemy at New Orleans. We would not take a ray from the sun of glory which halos the name of the commander in chief on that memorable occasion, nor would we refuse the homage of our respect and gratitude to the private who fought in the ranks, yet whose names shall never descend to posterity, or be known to their countrymen. Let songs of triumph and wreaths of glory swell the trump of fame, and deck the brow of the major general, while the name of the private shall pass unknown and unnoticed down the stream of time. Let the one receive tens of thousands from the public chest, while all that is given to the other is a few dollars, and the proud consciousness of having done his duty. The names of the commanders at Bridgewater and Chippewa, at Champlain and Erie, at Sandusky and New Orleans, shall long emblazon the page of history and command the nations gratitude, but they cannot command, nor will it be contended they are qualified to fill the highest civil stations in our country. In the address of March 4, we are told that general Jackson is no "less distinguished in civil than in military stations;" let this assertion be tested by facts. In 1797 he was elected to the United States senate, but resigned according to his confidential friend and biographer to make room for another citizen "who he conjectured, would, in that capacity, be able to render more services to the government than himself." His aid and biographer,

major Eaton, thus proceeds: "Immediately after his resignation he was appointed one of the judges of the supreme court of the state. Possibly alive to the difficult duties of this station and impressed with the great injury he might by erroneous decisions, he advanced to the office with reluctance, and in a short time resigned it, leaving it open for those who he believed were better qualified than himself to discharge its intricate and important duties."

Such are the reasons given, and the motives assigned by the intimate, and to this day my confidential friend of general Jackson, for having resigned the two most distinguished "civil stations" he ever held. If general Jackson voluntarily and of his own motive and consciousness retired from those two stations, from conviction that he was not qualified to fill them with what propriety can it be urged by others that he is qualified for a station abounding in infinitely more "intricate and important duties."

Here is one other civil station which was filled by the general, to which our attention is called by the Harrisburg address of March 4. When the state of Tennessee was admitted to the Union, general Jackson bore "an able and distinguished part" in the convention which framed for her the most democratic constitution of the Union." We shall first inquire how far the assertion, that the constitution of Tennessee is "the most democratic in the Union," is warranted by its provisions. This inquiry shall be strictly limited to a single point of vital moment, on which Pennsylvania has at all times been peculiarly jealous and watchful; we mean the right of suffrage. This is the very pivot on which democracy turns. If the constitution of Tennessee will not stand this test it does not deserve the high praise bestowed upon it. By that constitution the qualifications of a voter require that every freeman "shall possess a freehold or have resided six months in the county in which he shall vote. Art. 1, sect. 1. The qualifications of a voter require that he "shall possess, in his own right, in the county which he represents, not less than two hundred acres of land." Art. 1, sect. 7. And the qualifications of the governor require that he shall possess a freehold estate of five hundred acres of land." Art. 2, sect. 3.

These references shew the fatal errors, which will not say misrepresentations of the address of March 4, & demonstrate that the constitution of Tennessee is so far from being "the most democratic," that it is one of the most aristocratic "constitutions in the Union." Our task here would be imperfectly performed if we would not shew, that these aristocratic provisions, which bury the right of the poor man beneath the soil he cultivates, were sanctioned and supported by general Jackson. From page 29th of the journal of the proceedings of the convention of Tennessee, it appears, that "Mr. Cocke moved and was seconded by Mr. Jackson, [General Jackson,] that no person shall be eligible to seat in the general assembly, who has not resided three years in this state, and one in the county, immediately preceding the election, and shall possess, in his own right, in the county which he represents, not less than two hundred acres of land, and shall have attained the age of 21 years."

Thus it is proved, not only that the constitution of Tennessee is one of the most aristocratic constitutions of the Union, but that its most aristocratic provisions were made with the peculiar, special and express approbation of general Jackson. We are, in charity, bound to believe that those who subscribed the address of the 4th March, never read it, and that the author got up a work of imagination rather than a record of facts. If the facts had been fairly spread before the convention, they might have come to a very different conclusion from what they did on the groundless assertions which were made.

There is but one other statement in the address, relative to general Jackson, which we feel bound to correct. It is so full of errors that it will be necessary to quote it at length, even though we should be obliged to narrow down our corrections into the smallest possible compass. "On the eve of the battle of New Orleans, when alarm and dissatisfaction pervaded the city, general Jackson arrested a person discovered exciting mutiny in his camp, and refused him to the civil authority till Orleans was secured. For this refusal, which probably preserved Orleans from destruction, he was fined one thousand dollars."

On the 21st January general Jackson announced, in an address to his army, the complete discomfiture and retreat of the enemy. On the 7th March general Jackson arrested Mr. Soualliere, and imprisoned him in the barracks. He made oath to his imprisonment, and judge Hall granted a writ of Habeas Corpus, which was served upon general Jackson, who not only disobeyed the writ, but had the judge arrested and confined. What an outrage on all our political principles and forms of government! These arrests took place between the 5th and 14th March, after the news of peace had arrived at New Orleans, but before general Jackson had received official advices that the treaty had been ratified. It was for this assumption, this placing the military over the civil authority; for

\* See major Eaton's life of general Jackson, p. 17, first Philadelphia edition.