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In the House of Representatives Wednesday, May 1, 1991

A CONSTITUTIONAL LESSON FROM DAVY CROCKETT

Mr. Speaker, recently, a friend of mine, Dr. John Shea, who is a world renown otolaryngologist from Memphis, TN, brought to my attention a reproduction of a little story that I had not heard or seen in some time. The story was told on the House floor by Davy Crockett who was then serving as a U.S. Representative from Tennessee. His story concerns two votes on spending bills and how those votes were interpreted by one of his constituent’s. The story is an excellent lesson in the principles of the Constitution. In light of the obvious inability of Congress to resist the temptation to irresponsibly spend money that is not their own, I hope that my colleagues will read the following reproduction of Davy Crockett’s floor speech and grasp its significance and vote accordingly. HON. PHILIP M. CRANE OF ILLINOIS Wednesday, May 1, 1991

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
EVERY CONGRESSMAN NEEDS DAVY CROCKETT'S GREAT SPEECH AGAINST THE WELFARE STATE
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

One day in the House of Representatives, a bill was brought up to appropriate money for the benefit of the widow of a distinguished naval officer. Several beautiful speeches had been made in its support. The Speaker was just about to put the question to a vote when Colonel David Crockett arose:

"Mr. Speaker, I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased, and as much sympathy for the sufferings of the living, as any man in this House. But we must not permit our respect for the dead or our sympathy for apart of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living. I will not go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate this money as an act of charity. Every member upon this floor knows it.

"We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity; but as members of Congress we have no right to so appropriate a dollar of the public money. Some eloquent appeals have been made to us upon the ground that it is a debt due the deceased. Mr. Speaker, the deceased lived long after the close of the war; he was in office to the day of his death, and I have never heard that the government was in arrears to him.

"Every man in this House knows it is not a debt. We cannot, without the grossest corruption, appropriate this money as the payment of a debt. We have not the semblance of authority to
appropriate it as a charity. Mr. Speaker, I have said we have the right to give as much money of our own as we please. I am the poorest man on this floor. I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give one week’s pay to the object, and if every member of Congress will do the same, it will amount to more than the bills asks."

He took his seat. Nobody replied. The bill was put upon its passage and, instead of passing unanimously, as was generally supposed and as, no doubt, it would but for that speech, it received but few votes and was lost.

Later, when asked by a friend why he had opposed the appropriation, Crockett gave this explanation:

"Several years ago I was one evening standing on the steps of the Capitol with some other members of Congress, when our attention was attracted by a great light over in Georgetown. It was evidently a large fire. We jumped into a hack and drove over as fast as we could. In spite of all that could be done, many houses were burned and many families made homeless and, besides, some of them had lost all but the clothes they had on.

"The weather was very cold and, when I saw so many women and children suffering, I felt that something ought to be done for them. The next morning a bill was introduced, appropriating $20,000 for their relief. We put aside all other business and rushed it through as soon as it could be done.

"The next summer, when it began to be time to think about the election, I concluded I would take a scout around among the boys of my district. I had no opposition there but, as the election was some time off, I did not know what might turn up. When riding one day in a part of my district in which I was more of a stranger than in any other, I saw a man in a field plowing and coming toward the road.

"I gauged my gait so that we should meet as he came to the fence. As he came up, I spoke to the man. He replied politely, but, as I thought, rather coldly.

"I began: 'Well, friend, I am one of those unfortunate beings called candidates, and--'

" 'Yes, I know you; you are Colonel Crockett. I have seen you once before, and voted for you the last time you were elected. I suppose you are out electioneering now, but you had better not waste your time or mine. I shall not vote for you again.'

"This was a sockdolager. . . . I begged him to tell me what was the matter.

" 'Well, Colonel, it is hardly worthwhile to waste time or words upon it. I do not see how it can be mended, but you gave a vote last winter which shows that either you have not the capacity to understand the Constitution, or that you are wanting in the honesty and firmness to be guided by it. In either case, you are not the man to represent me. But I beg your pardon for expressing it in that way. I did not intend to avail myself of the privilege of the constituent to speak plainly to a candidate for the purpose of insulting or wounding you. I intend by it only to say that your understanding of the Constitution is very different from mine.'

'I will say to you what, but for my rudeness I should not have said, that I believe you to be honest. But an understanding of the Constitution different from mine I cannot overlook, because the Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred, and rigidly observed in all its provisions. The man who wields power and misinterprets it is the more dangerous the more honest he is.'
"I said, 'I admit the truth of all you say, but there must be some mistake about it, for I do not remember that I gave any vote last winter upon any Constitutional question.'

"'No, Colonel, there's no mistake. Though I live here in the backwoods and seldom go from home, I take the papers from Washington and read very carefully all proceedings of Congress. My papers say that last winter you voted for a bill to appropriate $20,000 to some sufferers by a fire in Georgetown. Is that true?'

"'Well, my friend, I may as well own up. You have got me there. But certainly nobody will complain that a great and rich country like ours should give the insignificant sum of $20,000 to relieve its suffering women and children, particularly with a full and overflowing treasury, and I am sure, if you had been there, you would have done just as I did.'

"'It is not the amount, Colonel, that I complain of; it is the principle. In the first place, the government ought to have in the treasury no more money than enough for its legitimate purposes. But that has nothing to do with the question. The power of collecting and disbursing money at pleasure is the most dangerous power that can be entrusted to man, particularly under our system of collecting revenue by a tariff, which reaches every man in the country, no matter how poor he may be, and the poorer he is the more he pays in proportion to his means.

"'What is worse, it presses upon him without his knowledge where the weight centers, for there is not a man in the United States who can ever guess how many thousands are worse off than he. If you had the right to give anything, the amount was simply a matter of discretion with you, and you had as much right to give $20,000,000 as $20,000.

'If you have the right to give to one, you have the right to give to all; and, as the Constitution neither defines charity nor stipulates the amount, you are at liberty to give to any and everything which you may believe, or profess to believe, is a charity, and to any amount you may think proper. You will very easily perceive what a wide door this would open for fraud and corruption and favoritism, on the one hand, and for robbing the people on the other.

'No, Colonel, Congress has no right to give charity. Individual members may give as much of their own money as they please, but they have no right to touch a dollar of the public money for that purpose. If twice as many houses had been burned in this county as in Georgetown, neither you nor any other member of Congress would have thought of appropriating a dollar for our relief. There are about two hundred and forty members of Congress. If they had shown their sympathy for the sufferers by contributing each one week's pay, it would have made over $13,000. There are plenty of wealthy men in and around Washington who could have given $20,000 without depriving themselves of even a luxury of life.

"'The Congressmen chose to keep their own money which, if reports be true, some of them spend not very creditably; and the people of Washington, no doubt, applauded you for relieving them from the necessity of giving by giving what was not yours to give. The people have delegated to Congress, by the Constitution, the power to do certain things. To do these, it is authorized to collect and pay moneys, and for nothing else. Everything beyond this is stipulation, and a violation of the Constitution.

'So you see, Colonel, you have violated the Constitution in what I consider a vital point. It is a precedent fraught with danger to the country, for when Congress once begins to stretch its power beyond the limits of the Constitution, there is no limit to it, and no security for the people. I have no doubt you
acted honestly, but that does not make it any better, except as far as you are personally concerned, and
you see that I cannot vote for you.'

"NOT YOURS TO GIVE"

"I tell you, I felt streaked. I saw if I should have opposition, and this man should go to talking, he would
set others to talking, and in that district I was a gone fawn-skin. I could not answer him, and the fact is,
I was so fully convinced that he was right, I did not want to. But I must satisfy him, and I said to him:

"'Well, my friend, you hit the nail upon the head when you said I had not sense enough to understand
the Constitution. I intended to be guided by it, and thought I had studied it fully. I have heard many
speeches in Congress about the powers of Congress, but what you have said here at your plow has got
more hard, sound sense in it than all the fine speeches I ever heard.

'If I had ever taken the view of it that you have, I would have put my head into the fire before I would
have given that vote; and if you will forgive me and vote for me again, if I ever vote for another
unconstitutional law I wish I may be shot.'

"He laughingly replied: 'Yes, Colonel, you have sworn to that once before, but I will trust you again on
one condition. You say that you are convinced that your vote was wrong. Your acknowledgment of it
will do more good than beating you for it. If, as you go around the district, you will tell people about
this vote, and that you are satisfied it was wrong, I will not only vote for you, but will do what I can to
keep down opposition, and, perhaps, I may exert some little influence in that way.'

'If I don't,' said I, 'I wish I may be shot; and, to convince you that I am in earnest in what I say, I will
come back this way in a week or ten days, and if you will get up a gathering of the people, I will make a
speech to them. Get up a barbecue, and I will pay for it.'

'No, Colonel, we are not rich people in this section, but we have plenty of provisions to contribute for a
barbecue, and some to spare for those who have none. The push of crops will be over in a few days, and
we can then afford a day for a barbecue. This is Thursday; I will see to getting it up on Saturday week.
Come to my house on Friday, and we will go together, and I promise you a very respectable crowd to
see and hear you.'

"'Well, I will be here. But, one thing more before I say good-bye. I must know your name.'

"'My name is Bunce.'

"'Well, Mr. Bunce, I never saw you before, though you say you have seen me, but I know you very well.
I am glad I have met you, and very proud that I may hope to have you for my friend.

"It was one of the luckiest hits of my life that I met him. He mingled but little with the public, but was
widely known for his remarkable intelligence and incorruptible integrity, and for a heart brimful and
running over with kindness and benevolence, which showed themselves not only in words, but in act.
He was the oracle of the whole country around him, and his fame had extended far beyond the circle of
his immediate acquaintances.

"Though I had never met him before, I had heard of him, and but for this meeting it is very likely I
should have had opposition and been beaten. One thing is certain, no man could now stand up in that
district under such a vote.

"At the appointed time I was at his house, having told our conversation to every crowd I had met, and to every man I stayed all night with, and I found that it gave the people an interest and a confidence in me stronger than I had ever seen manifested before.

"Though I was considerably fatigued when I reached his house, and under ordinary circumstances, should have gone early to bed, I kept him up until midnight, talking about the principles and affairs of government, and got more true knowledge of them than I had got all my life before.

"I have known and seen much of him since, for I respect him-no, that is not the word-I reverence and love him more than any living man. I got to see him two or three times every year; and I will tell you, sir, if everyone who professes to be a Christian lived and acted and enjoyed it as he does, the religion of Christ would take the world by storm.

"But to return to my story. The next morning we went to the barbecue and, to my surprise, found about a thousand men there. I met a good many whom I have not known before, and they and my friend introduced me around until I had got pretty well acquainted-at least, they all knew me.

"In due time notice was given that I would speak to them. They gathered up around a stand that had been erected. I opened my speech by saying:

'Fellow citizens, I present myself before you today feeling like a new man. My eyes have lately been opened to truths which ignorance or prejudice, or both, had heretofore hidden from my view. I feel that I can today offer you the ability to render you more valuable service than I have ever been able to render before. I am here today more for the purpose of acknowledging my error than to seek your votes. That I should make this acknowledgment is due to my self as well as to you. Whether you will vote for me is a matter for your consideration.'

"I went on to tell them about the fire and my vote for the appropriation and then told them that I was satisfied it was wrong. I closed by saying:

'And now, it remains for me to tell you that the most of the speech you have listened to with so much interest was simply a repetition of the arguments which your neighbor, Mr. Bunce, convinced me of my error.

A biography of Crockett follows this chapter:

Another rendition of this story by Allen Weiner,
http://crockettincongress.blogspot.com/2009/10/not-yours-to-give-fable-re-examined.html

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2009

"Not Yours to Give": A Fable Re-Examined
Any Google search for “David Crockett” or “Davy Crockett” will eventually turn up dozens of hits on conservative websites that relate the story of a speech Crockett allegedly gave in congress called “Not Yours to Give.”
A number of years ago, The Crockett Chronicle published an article I wrote, “Crockett and Bunce: A Fable Examined,” that debunked this story, but recently I’ve received a number of emails asking about the veracity of “Not Yours to Give,” so I figured it might be a good time to readdress the issue. Plus, in the process of researching “David Crockett in Congress,” I came upon new information that updates my Chronicle article.

The short answer is that “Not Yours to Give” is a fabrication.

The tale originated as “Davy Crockett’s Electioneering Tour,” a January 1867 article in Harper’s Magazine written by James J. Bethune, a pseudonym used by Edward S. Ellis. Ellis included the story in an 1884 edition of his Crockett biography, which has subsequently been republished repeatedly on the web by groups hoping to benefit from the Crockett association.

The story, as it is most commonly told, begins with Congressman Crockett delivering an address to the U.S. House of Representatives in opposition to an appropriation for the widow of a "naval officer" who is unidentified in the retelling.

Crockett goes to some lengths to explain to his colleagues that they have collectively no right to bestow public monies in the form of charity to any individual, even out of "respect for the dead or our sympathy for the living."

He goes on to state that such matters are more appropriately funded by charitable contributions from private individuals and offers to donate one week’s pay to the widow's relief if every other member of Congress will do the same. The tale then reports that the motion for the charity failed to pass due to Crockett’s erudition.

Congressman Crockett, usually a champion for the poor and disenfranchised, is later challenged about this rather uncharacteristic vote. In explanation, he recounts a story about a meeting with a constituent while on an earlier campaign, one Horatio Bunce, who refuses to support Crockett’s reelection effort. Bunce dresses David down for previously voting in favor of a bill that appropriated $20,000 in relief for the victims of a Georgetown fire, and expounds on this misuse of government funds. He accuses Crockett and his cohorts of a frivolous misuse of tax dollars for private gain, and then goes on to teach the Congressman about how the federal tax system should operate under the Constitution.

Crockett, awe-stricken, sees the error of his ways. He fears that Bunce will cost him votes because "he was the oracle of the whole country around him, and his fame had extended far beyond the circle of his immediate acquaintance." David vows that the scales have fallen from his eyes and that Bunce has shown him the light. He promises that he will never again vote to award tax receipts for relief efforts. Bunce, in turn, accepts Crockett’s change of heart as sincere and endorses his reelection bid.

This oft-repeated story is amusing, but problematic for a number of reasons.

The first part of the story gives a partially accurate account of Crockett’s opposition to the relief effort. Mrs. Brown was the widow of a General Brown, a veteran of the War of 1812. The General contracted an illness during his service that ultimately led to his demise, but he went on to serve in the public sector until his death some years later. A lengthy debate took place in the House of Representatives on April 1, 1828, over whether or not to award public funds to Mrs. Brown, who was portrayed as an indigent mother in desperate need of assistance.
Gale’s and Seaton’s Register of Debates of the House of Representatives 20th Congress, First Session, records that though David cast a vote against the bill, he was not present for the discussion.

On April 2, however, he and Thomas Chilton (who would go on to help Crockett write his autobiography) spoke out “in opposition to the principle of the bill” and Crockett followed by “offering to subscribe his quota, in his private character, to make up the sum proposed."

Unlike the tale told in the Ellis version and on the web though, Crockett’s opposition was countered by a spirited oration by Congressman Clark of New York. The motion for Mrs. Brown's relief was then carried by a vote of 97 to 74, with both Crockett and Chilton voting in the negative.

Perhaps the most egregious falsehood of the Ellis account is his rendering of Crockett’s explanation of his vote and his encounter with Horatio Bunce. Bunce’s opposition to Congressman Crockett is allegedly based on a vote Crockett made in favor of appropriations to the victims of a Georgetown fire. Crockett never made such a vote. The fire in question was not in Georgetown as stated, but in Alexandria, and the 19th Congress voted on the motion for relief for the victims on January 19, 1827.

David Crockett served his first term in the 20th Congress, which convened on December 3, 1827. In the spring of 1827, David was still on the campaign stump in Tennessee. He won the election in August of 1827.

Ellis also apparently confuses the widow Brown with the widow of naval officer Stephen Decatur. In 1830, Crockett was involved in a similar congressional debate over awarding some unremitted funds to Mrs. Decatur that her husband had claimed as bounty earned in a combat action. Crockett opposed the measure, but likely because of her reputation for profligacy and the fact that she hadn’t been married to Decatur when he’d won the contested prize.

Crockett typically considered petitions for individual relief on a case by case basis, but certainly wasn’t opposed to the government giving its wealth to his constituents despite what many of these websites claim.

His primary goal in congress was to acquire for his constituents legal title to the lands upon which they’d settled, and he petitioned the government repeatedly to provide this public acreage at little or no cost. Crockett was a tireless advocate for the poor, a populist who knew poverty firsthand, and he saw nothing wrong with government helping the little guy get ahead.

The Wiki Biography [political history] text copied:
Legislative career

Davy Crockett by William Henry Huddle, 1889
In 1817, Crockett moved the family to new acreage in Lawrence County, where he first entered public office as a commissioner helping to configure the new county’s boundaries.[77] On November 25, the state legislature appointed him county justice of the peace.[78] On March 27, 1818, he was elected lieutenant colonel of the Fifty-seventh Regiment of Tennessee Militia, defeating candidate Daniel Matthews for the position.[79] By 1819, Crockett was operating multiple businesses in the area and felt his public responsibilities were beginning to consume so much of his time and energy that he had little left for either family or business. He resigned from the office of justice of the peace and from his position with the regiment.[80]
Tennessee General Assembly
In 1821, he resigned as commissioner and successfully ran for a seat in the Tennessee General Assembly,[81] representing Lawrence and Hickman counties.[82] It was this election where Crockett honed his anecdotal oratory skills.[83] He was appointed to the Committee of Propositions and Grievances on September 17, 1821, and served through the first session that ended November 17, as well as the special session called by the governor in the summer of 1822, ending on August 24.[84][85] He favored legislation to ease the tax burden on the poor.[86] Crockett spent his entire legislative career fighting for the rights of impoverished settlers whom he felt dangled on the precipice of losing title to their land due to the state’s complicated system of grants.[87][86] He supported 1821 gubernatorial candidate William Carroll, over Andrew Jackson’s endorsed candidate Edward Ward.[88]

Less than two weeks after Crockett’s 1821 election to the General Assembly, a flood of the Tennessee River destroyed Crockett’s businesses.[89] In November, Elizabeth's father Robert Patton deeded 800 acres of his Carroll County property to Crockett.[90] Crockett sold off most of the acreage to help settle his debts, and moved his family to the remaining acreage on the Obion River, which remained in Carroll County until 1825 when the boundaries were reconfigured and put it in Gibson County.[91] In 1823, he ran against Andrew Jackson’s nephew-in-law William Edward Butler [92] and won a seat in the General Assembly representing the counties of Carroll, Humphreys, Perry, Henderson and Madison.[93] He served in the first session, which ran from September through the end of November 1823, and in the second session that ran September through the end of November 1824, championing the rights of the impoverished farmers.[94] During Andrew Jackson’s election to the United States Senate in 1823, Crockett backed his opponent John Williams.[95]

United States House of Representatives
On October 25, 1824, Crockett notified his constituents of his intention to run in the 1825 election for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. He lost that election to the incumbent Adam Rankin Alexander.[96] A chance meeting in 1826 gained him the encouragement of Memphis mayor Marcus Brutus Winchester[97] to try again to win a seat in Congress.[98] The Jackson Gazette published a letter from Crockett on September 15, 1826, announcing his intention of again challenging Rankin, stating his opposition to the policies of President John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State Henry Clay and Rankin’s position on the cotton tariff.[99] Militia veteran William Arnold also entered the race, and Crockett easily defeated both political opponents for the two-year term March 4, 1827 – March 3, 1829.[100][101] He arrived in Washington D.C. and took up residence at Mrs. Ball’s Boarding House, where a number of other legislators lived when Congress was in session.[102] Jackson was elected as President of the United States in 1828. Crockett continued his legislative focus on settlers getting a fair deal for land titles, offering H.R. 27 amendment to a bill sponsored by James K. Polk.[103]

I believed it was a wicked, unjust measure ... I voted against this Indian bill, and my conscience yet tells me that I gave a good honest vote, and one that I believe will not make me ashamed in the day of judgement.

David Crockett, A Narrative of the Life of David Crockett[104]
He was re-elected for the March 4, 1829 – March 3, 1831 session,[105] once again defeating Adam Rankin Alexander.[106] Crockett introduced H.R. 185 amendment to the land bill on January 29, 1830. The amendment was defeated May 3, 1830.[103] On February 25, 1830, Crockett introduced a resolution to abolish the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York,[107] because he felt it was public money going to benefit the sons of wealthy men.[108] He spoke out against Congress giving a lump sum amount of $100,000 to the widow of Stephen Decatur, citing that Congress was not empowered to do that.[109] Crockett opposed Jackson’s 1830 Indian Removal Act, and was the only member of the
Tennessee delegation to vote against it.[110] Cherokee chief John Ross sent him a letter on January 13, 1831, expressing his thanks for Crockett's vote.[111] His vote was not popular with his own district, and in 1831 he was defeated in the election by William Fitzgerald.[112]

Crockett ran against Fitzgerald again in the 1833 election and was returned to Congress, serving until 1835.[113][85] On January 2, 1834, Crockett introduced the land title resolution H.R. 126, but it never made it as far as being open for debate on the House floor.[103] He was defeated for re-election in the August 1835 election by Adam Huntsman.[114] During his last term in Congress, Crockett collaborated with Kentucky Congressman Thomas Chilton to write his autobiography which was published by E. L. Carey and A. Hart in 1834 as A Narrative of the Life of David Crockett, Written by Himself.[115] Crockett went east to promote the book. In 1836, newspapers published the now-famous quote attributed to Crockett upon his return to his home state. He said, "I told the people of my district that I would serve them as faithfully as I had done; but if not, they might go to hell, and I would go to Texas."[116]
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Learn about davy crockett spelling with free interactive flashcards. Choose from 500 different sets of flashcards about davy crockett spelling on Quizlet. Davy Crockett. wilderness. fought. AMatuska Vocabulary Lesson #2 Davy Crockett and Daniel Boone. allegory. conjecture. Davy Crockett was born in the wilderness. His father, John Crockett, was an Irish immigrant. He fought in the American Revolution. He was a very courageous man. Davy had a difficult childhood. His family was poor. When he was twelve years old, his father said, «Davy, our family doesn't have any money.» Davy Crockett became a United States Congressman! This was a great honour for him. In the United States Congress, he represented the people of Tennessee. Hero of the Alamo Davy Crockett was a colonel in the Tennessee Regulars and was elected to the House of Representatives from his native state. That was before his part in the valiant defense of the famed Alamo. He served three terms as congressman. While Crockett was in Congress a distinguished naval officer died, leaving a widow. Members of the House proposed to appropriate $20,000 of public money to give to the widow to assure her welfare and to honor the memory of the late officer. Crockett opposed that appropriation in such persuasive terms that it received only a few votes and was defeated.