

CONGRESS.

TWENTY-FIRST CONGRESS.....SECOND SESSION.

In the Senate, on the 19th ultimo, the bill making appropriation for the support of government for the year 1831, was considered, the question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. Tazewell, to strike out that part of the bill providing compensation to the commissioners who negotiated the Turkish treaty. Mr. Kane then moved to amend the amendment, by inserting the following (making compensation,) "to the person heretofore employed in our intercourse with the Sables and Porte, the further sum of twenty-five thousand dollars in addition to the sum of fifteen thousand dollars appropriated for the contingent expenses of foreign intercourse." Mr. Ellis then moved that the bill be laid on the table, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive business; which motions were carried.

In the House of Representatives, on the same day, Mr. Lea submitted a resolution in amendment of the report made by Mr. Homphill, on the subject of internal improvement provided for by Congress for this purpose, by the States respectively, and for the distribution of the same, according to representation and direct taxation. The various appropriation bills, considered on a preceding day, were read a third time and passed.

In the H. R. on the 21st, Mr. Findlay presented a memorial from certain Jews in Ohio, praying that the mails should not be permitted to be carried on Saturday, which they stated was their Sabbath. It was referred to the same committee as the memorials respecting the transportation of the Sunday mails. The consideration of the memorial of certain inhabitants of Massachusetts, on the subject of the Indians, was resumed, and Mr. Everett continued his remarks in support of it in an argument, in the course of which he contended that the rights of the Creeks and Cherokees had been infringed upon by Georgia, in contravention of the most solemn treaties on the part of the United States; and then, soon after the commencement of his remarks, Mr. Potter rose to a question of order, stating that in his view, there was no quorum present in the House; but the Speaker stating that motion was not admissible in that stage of question, the Mr. Everett proceeded. Mr. Haynes, of Georgia, replied in an animated and eloquent speech in vindication of the conduct, and in advocacy of the rights of the State of Georgia. Mr. Bell next addressed the House, and stated upon proofs which, as he observed, were satisfactory to him, that the great majority of the Cherokees were in the most squalid and miserable condition: no further advanced in civilization, or in the arts of social life, than their ancestors of a century ago. It was not the red men who were benefited under the present system, but some twenty or thirty whites who had insinuated themselves into the confidence of the Indians, and who, together with the half breeds, controlled the whole tribe, and acquired wealth at the expense of those for whose welfare so many philanthropic wishes were expressed in the House. He deplored the revivings and denunciations that had occurred during the discussions of this question, and deprecated the spirit of bigotry in which they had their origin. The people of Georgia would rather suffer military execution than recede from their expressed determination to sustain their laws; and would those who, from party feeling, pressed this measure forward at the awful risk of producing a civil war, persist in a course which, while it encroached upon the honor of the President, and the spirit of the constitution, placed the country upon the brink of an intestine commotion? After some further remarks, Mr. Bell, who was in a state of exhaustion from the effects of ill health, at the request of his friends, suspended his remarks.

In the Senate, on the 23d, the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the support of Government for 1831 having been resumed, Mr. Tazewell addressed the Senate at length in favor of the motion made by him to strike out the appropriation for the payment of the Commissioners who negotiated the Turkish treaty. Mr. Tazewell was followed by Messrs. Kane, Woodbury, and Livingston; the last named gentleman, however, after a brief exordium, and at a late hour, yielded the floor on a motion to adjourn.

In the H. R. on the same day, 2,000 copies of the report of Mr. Verplanck; from the select committee on the subject of the expediency of establishing assay offices in the gold Districts of North and South Carolina, and Georgia, were, on motion of Mr. Carson, ordered to be printed. The document in question is replete with many interesting and valuable facts, among which is the one that although the first native gold in the United States was discovered so recently as the year 1825, yet last year four fifths of the whole gold coinage of the mint, amounting altogether to \$643,165, was coined from gold collected in the southern part of Union. Of this, pure gold to the amount of \$24,000 was received from Virginia, \$204,000 from North Carolina, \$26,000 from South Carolina, and \$212,000 from Georgia, making an aggregate of four hundred and sixty six thousand dollars.

In the Senate on the 23d, the Chair laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, in reply to a resolution of the Senate on the subject of the execution of the laws of 1802, to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes.

The Senate then again resumed the consideration of the amendments proposed to the General Appropriation Bill; particularly that submitted by Mr. Tazewell, as proposed to be further amended by Mr. Kane.

Mr. Livingston took the floor, and spoke for two hours in support of the appropriation, and in reply to the remarks of Mr. Tazewell.

In the H. of R. on the same day, Mr. Bell, from the committee on Indian affairs, reported the bill from the Senate to provide for the removal of certain Indians from the State of Missouri, without amendment. The bill was then committed.

The Speaker laid before the House a communication from John D'Homergue, upon the subject of raising mulberry trees, and the production of silk, which was read and laid on the table.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the bill from the Senate, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make compensation to the heirs of Taliaferro Livingston and Thomas W. Armstrong, for the maintenance of fifteen Africans illegally imported into the United States.

A long debate again ensued on this bill. Finally the question was taken, and the bill was passed.

The engrossed bill for the erection of a National Armory on the western waters, was read the third time; and on motion, laid on the table, ayes 98, noes 56.

placed in your hand. These are not the only difficulties accompanying his apology: there are others still more formidable, and which must compel him to assign some other reason for disclosing the proceedings of the cabinet.

Mr. McDuffie's letter* to me, of the 14th instant, of which I enclose a copy, proves that Mr. Crawford spoke freely of the proceedings of the cabinet on his way to Georgia, in the summer of 1818; and dates will show that he could not at that time have seen the extract from the Nashville paper, on which he now rests his apology. The deliberation of the cabinet took place between the 14th and 25th July, 1818. On the former day, Mr. Monroe returned to Washington from London, and on the latter a general exposition of the views of the Government in relation to the operations in Florida appeared in the Intelligencer. The letter of Mr. Monroe to you, of the 19th July, 1818, fixes probably the day of the final decision of the cabinet. Mr. Crawford passed through Augusta on the 11th August, as announced in the papers of that city, on which day, or the preceding, his conversation, to which Mr. McDuffie's letter relates, must have taken place. On a comparison of these dates, you will see that it was impossible that Mr. Crawford could have seen the extract from the Nashville paper when he was in Edgefield, and he must consequently find some other apology for his disclosures. This was not the only instance of his making the disclosures before he saw the extract. He was at Milledgeville on the 16th of August, 1818, a few days after he passed through Augusta; and a little after, there appeared a statement in the Georgia Journal, somewhat varied from that made in Edgefield, but agreeing with it in most of the particulars. I cannot lay my hand on the article, but have a distinct recollection of it. You no doubt remember it. Circumstances fixed it on Mr. Crawford, and it has not, to my knowledge, been denied.

With such evidence of inaccuracy, either from want of memory, or some other cause, in what relates to his own motives and actions, it would be unreasonable to suppose that Mr. Crawford's statements will prove more correct in what relates to me. I will now proceed to examine them. He first states that I proposed that you should "be punished in some form, or reprimanded in some form;" and to make my course more odious, as I suppose, he adds, that "Mr. Calhoun did not propose to arrest General Jackson." I will not dwell on a statement which, on its face, is so absurd. How could an officer under our law be punished without arrest and trial? And to suppose that I proposed such a course, would indeed be to rate my understanding very low.

The next allegation requires much more attention. He says: "Indeed, my own views on the subject had undergone a material change after the cabinet had been convened. Mr. Calhoun made some allusion to a letter that General Jackson had written to the President, who had forgotten that he had received such a letter; but said that if he had received such a one, he would find it, and went directly to his cabinet, and brought it out. In it General Jackson approves of the determination of the Government to break up Amelia island and Galveztown; and gave it also as his opinion that Florida ought to be taken by the United States. He added, it might be a delicate matter for the Executive to decide, but if the President approved of it, he had only to give a hint to some confidential member of Congress, say Johnny Ray, and he would do it, and take the responsibility on himself. I asked the President if the letter had been answered: he replied, no; for that he had no recollection of receiving it. I then said that I had no doubt that General Jackson, in taking Pensacola, believed he was doing what the Executive wished. After that letter was produced, unanswered, I should have opposed the infliction of punishment on General Jackson, who had considered the silence of the President as a tacit consent; yet it was after the letter was produced and read, that Mr. Calhoun made the proposition to the cabinet for punishing the General." Again: "I do not know that I ever hinted at the letter to the President, yet that letter had a most important bearing on the deliberations of the cabinet, at least in my mind, and possibly on the minds of Mr. Adams and the President, but neither expressed any opinion on the subject. It seems it had none on the mind of Mr. Calhoun, for it made no change in his conduct."

It will be no easy matter for Mr. Crawford to reconcile the statement which he has thus circumstantially made, with his conduct in relation to the Seminole affair, from the time of the decision of the cabinet till the subject ceased to be agitated.

How will he, in the first instance, reconcile it with his Edgefield statement, of which Mr. McDuffie's letter gives an account? The contrast between that and the present is most striking; to illustrate which, I will give an extract from Mr. McDuffie's letter. Mr. McDuffie's letter

says, that 'he' (Mr. Crawford) "stated that you" (Mr. Calhoun) "had been in favor of an inquiry into the conduct of General Jackson, and that he was the only member of the cabinet that concurred with you. He spoke in strong terms of disapprobation of the course pursued by General Jackson, not only in his military proceedings, but in prematurely bringing the grounds of his defence before the country, and forestalling public opinion; thus anticipating the administration. On this point, he remarked, that, if the administration could not give direction to public opinion, but permitted a military officer, who had violated his orders, to anticipate them, they had no business to be at Washington, and had better return home."

Such was the language then held, and such his tone of feeling at that time. We hear not one word of the letter which makes so conspicuous a figure in his present statement; not one word of the change it effected in his mind in relation to your conduct; not a word of his taking a course different from me; but on the contrary, he then stated, directly, that he concurred with me in favoring an inquiry, and indicated no difference on any other point; and so far from exempting you from the charge of breach of orders, as he now attempts to do, he asserted, positively, that you had violated your orders. Shall we find the explanation of the contrast in the two statements in the difference of his motives then and now? Is his motive now to injure me, and was it then to attack another member of the administration? Or must it be attributed, as the more charitable interpretation, to the decay of memory? Whatever may be the true explanation, all will agree that a statement, when events were fresh in the memory, is to be trusted in preference to one made twelve years after the transaction, particularly if the former accords with after events, and the latter does not, as is the case in this instance. At the next session of Congress, your conduct in the Seminole war was severely attacked in both branches of the Legislature. Let us see if the course pursued by Mr. Crawford and his personal and confidential friends can be reconciled to the statement which he now gives of his course in the cabinet. Mr. Cobb, of Georgia, now no more, was then a prominent member of the House of Representatives. He was the particular, personal, and confidential friend of Mr. Crawford, his near neighbor, and formerly a law student under him. What part did he take? He led the attack; he moved the resolutions against you; he accused you expressly of the violation of your orders, and sustained the accusation with all his powers.* All this accords with Mr. Crawford's statement of his sentiment and his course at the time; but how can it be reconciled to his present statement? How could he, on any principle of justice, stand by and hear you thus falsely accused, in the face of the world, when he, according to his showing now, knew that it was all false? And how can he reconcile his silence then, when you stood so much in need of his assistance, with his disclosures now, when the agitation has long since passed away, and his aid no longer required? But let us turn to the other branch of the Legislature, and see whether any occurrence there can explain this apparent mystery. General Lacoek, of Pennsylvania, the particular friend of Mr. Crawford, and in the habit of constant intercourse with him, was the chairman of the committee in that body to whom the part of the message which related to the Seminole war was referred. Mr. Forsyth, then and now a Senator from Georgia, and who now acts a prominent part in the transaction which has given rise to the present correspondence, was also a member, and was then, as he is now, an intimate, personal, and political friend of Mr. Crawford. With two such able and influential friends on the committee, he had the most favorable opportunity that could be offered to do you justice. According to his own statement, he felt no obligation to observe silence in relation to the proceedings of the cabinet. Why, then, did he not interpose with his friends on the committee to do you justice? That he did not, I need not offer you arguments to prove. The report of the committee is sufficient testimony. Should he say that he was restrained by feelings of delicacy from interfering with his friends on the committee, how will he reconcile, on the principles of justice and honor, his silence after the report so severely assailing your motives and conduct was made, when, admitting his present statement, it was completely in his power to shield you from censure?

But why should I waste time and words to prove that Mr. Crawford's whole course is in direct conflict with his present statement of the proceedings of the cabinet, when there remains no objection that cannot be surmounted? The statement is entirely destitute of foundation. It is not true. Strange as it may appear, after an account so minute and circumstantial, no such letter as he refers to was ever before the cabinet, or alluded to in its deliberations. My memory is distinct and clear, and is confirmed by the no less distinct

recollection of Mr. Monroe and Mr. Wirt, as will fully appear by copies of their statements, herewith enclosed. Feelings of delicacy, growing out of the political relation of Mr. Adams and Mr. Crowninshield, the other members of the then administration, both towards you and myself, have restrained me from applying for their statements, but I have not the least apprehension that they would vary from Mr. Monroe's or Mr. Wirt's.*

Comment is useless, I will not attempt to explain so gross a misstatement of the proceedings of the cabinet, but will leave it to those friends of Mr. Crawford who have placed him in this dilemma to determine whether his false statement is to be attributed to an entire decay of memory, or to some other cause; and if the former, to exempt themselves from the responsibility of thus cruelly exposing a weakness which it was their duty to conceal.

It now becomes necessary to say something of your letter of the 6th January, to which Mr. Crawford has given, in his statement, so much prominence. My recollection in relation to it accords with Mr. Monroe's statement. I came into his room when he had apparently just received the letter. He was indisposed at the time. I think he opened the letter in my presence, and finding that it was from you, he gave me the letter to read. I cast my eyes over it, and remarked that it related to the Seminole affair, and would require his attention, or something to that effect: I thought no more of it. Long after, I thought it was at the commencement of the next session of Congress, I heard some allusion which brought the letter to my recollection. It was from a quarter which induced me to believe that it came from Mr. Crawford. I called and mentioned it to Mr. Monroe, and found that he had entirely forgotten the letter. After searching some time, he found it among some other papers, and read it, as he told me, for the first time.

Having stated these facts, I should be wanting in candor were I not also to state, that, if the facts had been otherwise; had Mr. Monroe read your letter; and intentionally omitted to answer it, and had it been brought before the cabinet, in my opinion it would not have had the least influence on its deliberation. The letter was not received till several weeks after the orders to you were issued, and could not, therefore, as you know, have had any influence in drawing them up; and such, I conceive, was your opinion, as I do not find any allusion to the letter in your public or private correspondence at the time, which would not have been the case, had it, in your opinion, formed a part of your justification. You rested your defence on what I conceive to be much more elevated ground—on the true construction, as you supposed, of your orders, and the necessity of the measures which you adopted to terminate the war, and not on any supposed secret wish of the Executive in opposition to the public orders under which you acted. Mr. Crawford, in placing your justification now on such grounds, not only exposes your motives to be questioned, but, as far as his acts can, greatly weakens your defence.

On a review of this subject, it is impossible not to be struck with the time and mode of bringing on this correspondence. It is now twelve years since the termination of the Seminole war. Few events in our history have caused so much excitement, or been so fully discussed, both in and out of Congress. During a greater part of this long period, Mr. Crawford was a prominent actor on the public stage, seeing and hearing all that occurred, and without restraint, according to his own statement, to disclose freely all he knew; yet not a word is uttered by him in your behalf; but now, when you have triumphed over all difficulties, when you no longer require defence, he, for the first time, breaks silence, not to defend you, but to accuse one who gave you every support in your hour of trial in his power, when you were fiercely attacked, if not by Mr. Crawford himself, at least by some of his most confidential and influential friends. Nor is the manner less remarkable than the time. Mr. Forsyth, a Senator from Georgia, here in his place, writes to Mr. Crawford, his letter covering certain enclosures, and referring to certain correspondence and conversations in relation to my conduct in the cabinet deliberation on the Seminole question. Mr. Crawford answers, correcting the statements alluded to in same instances, and confirming and amplifying in others; which answer he authorizes Mr. Forsyth to show me, if he pleased. Of all this, Mr. Forsyth gives me not the slightest intimation, though in the habit of almost daily intercourse in the Senate; and instead of showing me Mr. Crawford's letter, as he was authorized to do, I hear of it, for the first time, by having a copy put into my hand under cover of your letter of the 13th instant—a copy with important blanks, and unaccompanied with Mr. Forsyth's letter, with its enclosures, to which Mr. Crawford's is in answer.

Why is this so? Why did not Mr. Forsyth see my letter to Mr. Monroe and Mr. Wirt, and their answers; also, letter to Mr. Adams, and his answer, written since the date of this letter.—Mr. Crowninshield, the other member of the cabinet, was absent: see his letter. See Appendix, J. K. L. M. N. O. P.

Forsyth himself show me the letter—the original letter? By what authority did he place a copy in your hands? None is given by the writer. Why is your name interposed? Was it to bring me into conflict with the President of the United States? If the object of the correspondence between Mr. Crawford and Mr. Forsyth be to impeach my conduct, as it would seem to be, by what rule of justice am I deprived of evidence material to my defence, and which is in the hands of my accusers—of a copy of Mr. Forsyth's letter, with the enclosures; of a statement of the conversation and correspondence of the two individuals whose names are in blank in the copy of Mr. Crawford's letter furnished me? Why not inform me who they are? Their testimony might be highly important, and even their names alone might throw much light on this mysterious affair.

I must be frank. I feel that I am deprived of important right, by the interposition of your name, of which I have just cause to complain.

It deprives me of important advantages, which would otherwise belong to my position. By the interposition of your name, the communication which would exist between Mr. Forsyth and myself, had he placed Mr. Crawford's letter in my hands, as he was authorized to do, is prevented, and I am thus deprived of the right which would have belonged to me in that case, and which he could not in justice withhold, of being placed in possession of all the material facts and circumstances connected with this affair. In thus complaining, it is not my intention to attribute to you any design to deprive me of so important an advantage. I know the extent of your public duties, and how completely they engross your attention. They have not allowed you sufficient time for reflection in this case, of which evidence is afforded by the ground that you assume in placing the copy of Mr. Crawford's letter in my hand, which you state was submitted by his authority. I do not so understand him; the authority was, as I conceive, to Mr. Forsyth, and not to yourself, and applied to the original letter, and not to the copy, both of which, as I have shown, are very important in this case, and not mere matters of form. I have asked the question, why is this affair brought up at this late period, and in this remarkable manner? It merits consideration, at least from myself. I am in the habit of speaking my sentiments and opinions freely, and I see no cause which ought to restrain me on the present occasion. I should be blind not to see that this whole affair is a political manoeuvre, in which the design is that you should be the instrument and myself the victim, but in which the real actors are carefully concealed by an artful movement. A naked copy, with the names referred to in blank, affords slender means of detection, while, on the contrary, had I been placed, as I ought to have been, in possession of all the facts which I was entitled to be, but little penetration would probably have been required to see through the whole affair. The names which are in blank might of themselves, through their political associations, point directly to the contrivers of this scheme. I wish not to be misunderstood. I have too much respect for your character to suppose you capable of participating in the slightest degree in a political intrigue. Your character is of too high and generous a cast to resort to such means, either for your own advantage or that of others. This the contrivers of the plot well knew, but they hoped through your generous attributes, through your lofty and jealous regard for your character, to excite feelings through which they expected to consummate their designs. Several indications forewarned me long since that a blow was meditated against me; I will not say from the quarter from which this comes; but in relation to this subject, more than two years since, I had a correspondence with the District Attorney for the Southern District of New York, on the subject of the proceedings of the cabinet on the Seminole war, which, though it did not then excite particular attention, has since, in connexion with other circumstances, served to direct my eye to what was going on.

Of Mr. Crawford I speak with pain, and only in self defence; but, that you may more fully realize the spirit which actuates him, and how little scrupulous he is of the means that he uses where I am concerned, I would refer you for illustration to facts in the possession of one who stands to you in the relation of a constitutional adviser, and who from his character is entitled to your entire confidence. I mean the Postmaster General. No one knows better than yourself how sacred the electoral college for the choice of President and Vice President should be considered in our system of government. The electors are the trustees of the high sovereign power of the people of the States, as it relates to the choice of those magistrates; and on the degree of fidelity with which the trust may be discharged depends, in a great degree, the successful operation of our system. In order to prevent, as far as practicable, political intrigue, or the operation of extraneous influence on the choice of the electoral college, it is provided that they shall meet in their respective States; and that they shall vote, throughout the Union, on the same day, and be selected within thirty-four days of the time designated for the election: thus excluding with the greatest care all other influence on the choice of the electors, except the will of their constituents; but where the object was to injure me, the sacred character of the college was an insufficient restraint. Mr. Crawford wrote to Major Barry, in October, 1828, (a copy of whose letter he has furnished me at my request,) requesting him earnestly to use his influence with the electors not to vote for me as Vice President, though he could not be ignorant that I had been nominated for that office, on the preceding 6th of January, when your friends nominated you, in a State convention for the high station which you now hold, and that the electors were pledged to vote for you as President, and myself as Vice President. This is not the only instance of his interference. He pursued the same course in Tennessee and Louisiana as I am informed on the highest authority.

At an earlier period, he resorted to means not much less objectionable to injure my standing, and to influence as far as I was concerned the election. I am not ignorant of his correspondence with that view, and which I feel confident has not escaped your observation. But I will not dwell on this disagreeable subject. I have no resentment towards Mr. Crawford. I have looked on in silence, without resorting to any means to counteract the injury which he intended me, and I now depart from the rule which I have carefully observed ever since the termination of the Presidential election in 1825, because his present attack comes through a channel, my high respect for which would not permit me to be silent. I have, however, in noticing what I could not pass over, situated as I now am, endeavored to limit myself by the line of self defence, and if I have apparently gone beyond in making any remarks on his conduct, which his letter did not naturally suggest, my apology will be found in the necessity of showing the state of his feelings towards me, so that the motive which influenced him in the course which has caused this correspondence may be fully understood.

I am, sir, respectfully, your ob't serv't,
JOHN C. CALHOUN.
President JACKSON.

*The letter of the Hon. George McDuffie, Appendix, marked G.

*See Appendix H—letters from Hon. Robert Garnett.