



# LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

## **Ratified treaty no. 91, Documents relating to the negotiation of the treaty of January 22, 1818, with the Creek Indians. January 22, 1818**

Washington, D.C.: National Archives, January 22, 1818

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/URPAHJTDNYGBV8R>

As a work of the United States government, this material is in the public domain.

For information on re-use see:

<http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/Copyright>

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

RATIFIED TREATY NO. 91  
DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE NEGOTIATION OF THE  
TREATY OF JANUARY 22, 1818, WITH THE CREEK INDIANS

Creek Agency

28 June 1818.

David B. Mitchell Esq

sending a treaty made  
with the Creeks - relative  
to the Creek - a map of the  
region enclosed - the

treaty sent to the Senate to be  
ratified - map lodged in topographical  
survey -

5009

March 1818.

Creek Agency

28<sup>th</sup> Jan'y 1818

Sir

I have the honor to enclose a Treaty made with the heads men of the Creek Nation at this place on the 22<sup>nd</sup> Inst. The extent of Territory Ceded is much greater and the price given much less, than I had any reason to expect either would be at the Commencement of the Meeting, It is the result of my best exertions and I trust will meet the approbation of Government.

The great extent of Territory which this nation lost by the late war makes them reluctant in parting with any more, and I could not prevail upon them to make the Benulgee the boundary of the second tract mentioned in the treaty neither would they consent to bring the line of the lower tract

so high up as Fort Hawkins It is my Opinion  
however that these two points can be attained  
before many years. There is a tract  
of Land lying on Wills Creek and between  
that Creek and the Coosa River on the West  
side of the latter, and north of the Treaty line  
of Fort Jackson which they may be prevailed  
upon to part with, in treating for which  
they are willing to discuss and settle the  
subject of the boundary between them and  
the Cherokees. They however contend  
that their present boundary with the  
Cherokees is by the Suwannee path where  
it leaves the Western line of Jackson  
County to the Suwannee old town on the  
Chatahochee River and from thence by a  
direct line to the Mouth of a certain water  
course called by them Little River where it  
unites with the Coosa. They have  
furnished me with a copy of certain Questions  
put by the Creeks to an old Cherokee Chief  
and the Cherokee Interpreter (who was their mutual  
Interpreter on the first Settlement of the Cherokees

in the Creek Country) at their late meeting a copy of which and the answers is enclosed by which it does appear that the Cherokees have for a long time occupied and do now occupy a certain portion of Creek land and that they do not claim lower down the Chatahatchie than Suwannee old town the path to which from the high shoals of the Appalachee has always been considered as their boundary East of Chatahatchie. This is a very different boundary to that which Mr. Graham informed me in his letters of the 31<sup>st</sup> October last was understood by the Government to be the true boundary between the two nations

It has always been customary at meetings of the Indians called by the Agent either for Treaty or for payment of Annuitie for the Agent to furnish provision during such meetings and as the Indians at the Meeting at Fort Hawkins in July last paid for the provision expended out of their annuity Mr. Graham desired me to provide

for the amount in the treaty which has just been concluded and which was then in contemplation. This however has not been done because the Indians did not seem to understand the necessity of inserting it and did not wish the sum to appear larger than what they actually received for their land, I therefore did not insist upon it but there can be no objection on that account to its being appropriated by Congress when appropriations are made to carry the Treaty into effect if approved by the President and ratified by the Senate. The sum expended was a little upwards of Six Thousand Dollars.

I shall have the honor to address you again by next mail upon some important matters relating to this Agency which the want of time prevents my doing now.

I am,  
Sir,

with high consideration  
Your very ob. Servt.

D. Mitchell  
Agent for I.A.

The Honorable  
John C. Calhoun  
Secretary of War.

3906