WILLIAM HENDRICKS was born at Ligonier, Westmoreland county, Pennsylvania, November 12, 1782. He received his education in the common schools at Cannonsburg, having as classmate Dr. Andrew Wylie, who later became president of Indiana University.

When he reached manhood, Hendricks left Pennsylvania for Cincinnati, Ohio, where he stayed a year or two, studying law. After being admitted to the bar, he came, in 1813, to Madison, Jefferson county, which remained his home until his death.

When Hendricks came to Indiana he was without friends, money, or patronage, but he immediately got into politics. He had brought with him a printing press and soon commenced to publish a weekly paper, the Madison Western Eagle. Through this paper he became well known and soon made his way into politics.

Indiana was at that time still a territory, and to the Territorial General Assembly which met at Corydon November 1, 1813, Hendricks was elected to represent Jefferson county in place of William McFarland, who had resigned. He was also territorial printer for this, the second session of the Fourth General Assembly, printing the Acts of the Assembly at the office of the Western Eagle at Lexington. He represented his county in the special session of June 1, 1814, and again in the first session of the Fifth Assembly, August 15, 1814, to September 10, 1814, when he was elected Speaker. At the second session of the Fifth Assembly, he served as clerk of the House, an office he had also held at the first session of the Fourth Assembly.

When the Constitutional Convention met at Corydon, June 10, 1816, Hendricks attended, although he was not a delegate. He was elected secretary of the convention, and discharged his duties so well that when the convention adjourned he had acquired a reputation for ability and political sagacity not surpassed by any one in Indiana.
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August 5 of the same year, at the last election held under the territorial government, Hendricks was elected to Congress, defeating Allen T. Thom. At this time Indiana was entitled to only one Representative in Congress. December 2, 1816, he qualified and took his seat in the second session of the Fourteenth Congress. He was placed on the Committee on Public Lands.

Hendricks's first speech in the House was on the Compensation Law. Colonel R. M. Johnson, of Kentucky, had reported a bill to repeal the Compensation Law, which had been passed at the previous session, giving a salary of $3,000 to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House and $1,500 to each member of the Senate and House, in place of $6 a day, the previous compensation. Hendricks, together with James Noble and Waller Taylor, the Indiana Senators, had been instructed by the Indiana legislature to try to get this law repealed. In his speech, Hendricks showed how the ideas of expenditure of his constituents differed from those of the eastern cities. The people of the West had little means of getting money, and $6 a day, the previous compensation for members of Congress, seemed big enough to them. He did not think lowering the compensation would exclude the best talent of the country. This act was repealed March 19, 1819.

On February 12, 1817, when the Senate and House met to count the electoral votes, the question arose as to whether the votes of Indiana should be counted. Congressman Taylor of New York objected because the enabling act admitting Indiana was not passed until December 11, 1816, while the electors had been chosen before this time. The Senate withdrew while the House considered the question. Hendricks made a plea for his State. He argued that the only question for Congress to decide was whether the State had a constitution that was republican. He said the same authority which gave him the right to vote in the House gave Indiana also a right to vote for President and Vice-President. The House did not come to any conclusion, so the votes were counted.

Hendricks was elected to Congress again August 4, 1817, over Thomas Posey who had been Territorial Governor from 1812 to 1816. In a letter published in the Indiana Republican at Madison, September 16, 1817, he answered the attacks of his enemies. Before this he had paid no attention to the abuse of newspapers, but now
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he proceeded to answer questions which the Indiana Herald had put to him. The Herald had charged him with having procured the appointment of printers of the laws of the United States for the editors of the Gazette at Corydon, instead of for the Herald. To this Hendricks replied that it was proper that the laws should be published at the seat of government by a paper established there. Besides, neither he nor Senator James Noble had been informed that the editors of the Herald wanted the appointment, while the editors of the Gazette had made application.

Another serious charge was that he had tried to have the printing of the laws taken away from Elihu Stout of the Vincennes Sun. This Hendricks declared was charged in order to make the people of the West think he was trying to take away from them the means of promulgating their laws. He said he had given his opinion of Stout as an editor, saying that he was indolent and not punctual in publication, all of which was undoubtedly true. However, he had refrained from mentioning what he might have—the fact that Elihu Stout had permitted all kinds of slander and abuse against the government to be published in his paper.

Hendricks had been further charged by the Herald with procuring for Armstrong Brandon, the editor of the Gazette, the appointment of postmaster at Corydon, while disregarding Willis M'Bean, who had been recommended by Harvey Heth, the former postmaster. Hendricks proceeded to tell his side of the story. Early in the last session, Harvey Heth had sent a letter to the Postmaster General, tendering his resignation. He named Willis M'Bean as his successor, proposing to transfer his papers to him as soon as M'Bean was authorized to receive them. His letter was handed over to Hendricks.

Hendricks, wondering that the people of Corydon had not recommended Willis M'Bean or any one else, thought that they did not know of the resignation. He decided to wait until he received letters from Corydon. On the second mail he received letters telling of Harvey Heth's resignation and of the application of Armstrong Brandon, who was well recommended. The Postmaster General also received recommendations favoring Brandon. It was only then that Hendricks acquiesced in this nomination.

Hendricks had also been abused for his correspondence with the Acting Secretary of War on the subject of the claims of the militia of Indiana for services in the War of 1812. The recognition of these claims had been brought about by Jennings while in Congress.
Hendricks declared that in spite of the abuse of the *Herald* he would do all he could at the next session to get the militia and rangers paid. He would not rest until every cent had been paid them.

Hendricks claimed that no fault could be found with any of his acts. All the opposition he had met with was due to the fact that people were jealous because a man, who had come to Indiana without money or friends, should so soon get into Congress.

He traced the opposition of the *Herald* back to the time when its editors had been disappointed by not being appointed printers of the United States laws. This was in January, 1817. Since then they had abused him without ceasing. On March 5 they had advertised a caucus which met March 15 to select a candidate to oppose Hendricks for Congress. Nothing was done here but to arrange for a meeting April 28, the first day of court, when the citizens of Harrison county would attend and might favor candidates at that place. This caucus, however, was abandoned.

On May 10, the *Herald* justified caucus nominations as the best way of bringing out candidates, but May 24 one of the editors announced himself as candidate without a caucus nomination.

About August 1 Thomas Posey was brought forward as candidate by a small caucus at Vincennes. The *Western Sun*, which had formerly been hostile to a caucus, was now silent. Hendricks professed the highest respect for Thomas Posey, who had long been in public life. He said he would have withdrawn in favor of Posey but that the latter had been brought forward by his own avowed enemies with the purpose of defeating him. If he had withdrawn it would have given too much satisfaction to his enemies.

At the first session of the Fifteenth Congress, Hendricks was again placed on the Committee on Public Lands, on which committee he served during his tenure of six years in Congress. During this session he made a speech on the Jeffersonville Canal. March 6, 1818, he offered a resolution regarding the subscription by the United States for shares in this canal company. Indiana had just passed a law incorporating the company with a capital of $1,000,000, for the purpose of making a canal around the falls of the Ohio river at Jeffersonville. In his speech at the time that he presented the resolution, Hendricks showed the importance of this canal to the States of Kentucky, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, as well as to all the western country. The falls were the only obstacle to the
navigation of the Ohio; the removal of this obstacle would have a
great bearing on the commerce and prosperity of the West. It was
also important from a national point of view, as military stores for
the West must pass down the Ohio. At this time Hendricks men-
tioned the need of a military road from the Falls to the south head
of Lake Michigan, this road to be used for transporting military
stores and supplies to Chicago, Fort Gratiot at the outlet of Lake
Huron, and other fortifications west as far as the Mississippi.8

Hendricks was re-elected to Congress August 3, 1818, over Reuben
W. Nelson, and again, August 7, 1820, he defeated the same op-
ponent. In the first session of the Sixteenth Congress, the question
of this amendment. He spoke of the policy of the government fol-
New York proposed that the bill for admission be amended by incor-
porating in the fourth section a provision that there be neither slavery
nor involuntary servitude in Missouri except for punishment of
crime, and that fugitive slaves be returned.9 Hendricks was in favor
of this amendment. He spoke of the policy of the government fol-
lowed in the Northwest Territory and showed the result of that wise
and liberal policy, adding that if this same policy should “roll on
with the flood of emigration to the West” it “would add a constella-
tion to the Union equal in luster to the brightest stars of the East.”10

He answered the objections of those who opposed Taylor's amend-
ment because they thought it imposed conditions on a State, by say-
ing this was concerned with Missouri as a territory and not as a
State.11 Congress can impose conditions on a territory. It owns
the soil of the territory and can prevent citizens, whether from the
North or South, from settling that territory.12 Furthermore, it may
refuse admission to new States if their constitutions contain anything
that might cause invasion and violence. Hendricks went on to show
that slavery came under this provision. “Slavery,” he said, “is an
evil. It is admitted so by all in the South. Its existence is a matter
of much lamentation to them.” He ended by saying that the Con-
stitution, while providing for slavery, had never meant to foster and
cherish it.13

Hendricks was censured for his attitude toward the admission of
Missouri. February 17, 1821, a meeting was got up at Montgom-
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eryville, Indiana, in which James Noble, who was in the Senate, and Hendricks in the House, were severely denounced for their opposition to admission without restriction. The Indiana legislature, by a vote of 22 to 5, on the other hand, passed censure on Senator Waller Taylor for voting against restriction, and requested its Senators and Representatives to procure the passage of a law by Congress authorizing the people of the Territory of Missouri to revise their constitution, so as to provide that no more slaves be admitted, and that they make no restriction on the right of free persons to settle and reside in their territory. 14

In 1822, Hendricks ran for Governor against Barrach B. Dimmich. At the August election he received 18,340 votes, nearly all that were cast. Ratliff Boone was elected Lieutenant Governor. Hendricks resigned from the House and Jonathan Jennings was elected to succeed him. December 4, 1822, Hendricks entered on his duties as Governor.

In his message to the Legislature of Indiana, December, 1822, he said: “Let us not lose sight of those great objects to which the means of the State should at some future day be devoted—the navigation of the Falls of the Ohio, the improvement of the Wabash and the White rivers and of other streams, and the construction of the National and other roads through the State.” 15 However, the people of Indiana were struggling under business depression and little was done by the Legislature during the time Hendricks was Governor except in the cause of education. 16 December 1, 1823, Christopher Harrison made a report of the condition of the three per cent. fund, of which he was the agent. In 1824, the Legislature appointed him and Hendricks commissioners to open a canal around the Falls of the Ohio. Their report was given January 18, 1825. 17 Very little was done.

During the time Hendricks was Governor, the capital was changed from Corydon to Indianapolis. 18 The same winter he was elected to the United States Senate. The election took place January 12, 1825. On the first ballot, Isaac Blackford received 26 votes, Hendricks 25, and Jonathan Jennings 10, scattering 1; on the fourth ballot, Hendricks was elected by a vote of 32 to Blackford’s 30. On February 12, 1825, Hendricks resigned as Governor to become United
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States Senator. There was no Lieutenant Governor to succeed him, as Ratliff Boone had previously resigned. James B. Ray, President pro tem. of the State Senate, became Acting Governor, serving until December 25, the close of the term.

Hendricks was elected to a second term in the Senate by the State Legislature December 18, 1830. On the first ballot he received 31 votes, Ratliff Boone 26, John Law 12, Charles Dewey 9, scattering 4; on the fourth ballot Hendricks was elected, receiving 44, Boone 26, Law 9, Dewey 3.

On entering the Senate in 1825, Hendricks was placed on the Committee on Roads and Canals, on which committee he served during his twelve years in the Senate, acting as chairman from 1830 to 1837. He was a firm believer in internal improvements and favored the building of roads and canals in all parts of the country. On this committee he did some very good work for the West and for his own State.

His first speech in the Senate was February 14, 1826, on the subject of the Florida canal. A bill for the survey of Florida with a view to a canal across it had been reported back by the Committee on Roads and Canals with an amendment providing for the survey of the country between the Apalachicola and Mississippi rivers, with a view to the formation of inland navigation. Hendricks from the Committee on Roads and Canals explained the amendment which would mean the extension of the survey to the Mississippi river. The Committee had examined the maps of the coast from the Apalachicola to the Mississippi, showing a continuation of bays, sounds, and inlets that made inland navigation for 350 miles practicable. Hendricks advocated this canal, as it would make it possible for the produce of the western country, coming down the Mississippi, to go in the same boat directly into the canal and then to the Atlantic markets, instead of being stopped at New Orleans.19

He answered the constitutional objections of those who were opposed by saying that in 1824 a law had been passed authorizing the President to make surveys of roads and canals that were of national importance. Thirty million dollars had been appropriated for this, and if this sum was not all spent, the Secretary of War would direct the survey.20

Hendricks believed that the proposed canal would be very valuable, as it would remove the necessity of navigation across the Gulf.
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of Mexico and around the West Indies, and thus relieve commerce of the danger of piracy and shipwreck. He prophesied that the day was not far off when a canal at the Isthmus of Panama would give this proposed canal much of the commerce of the East Indies and the Pacific. The amendment of the Constitution was rejected and the bill that was approved March 3, 1826, provided only for the survey of Florida from the St. Mary's river to the Apalachicola, and from the St. John's river to Suwanee bay. Twenty thousand dollars was appropriated for this work.21

In this same session of Congress the subject of the Wabash-Erie canal was brought up. Congress had, on May 20, 1824, passed an act authorizing Indiana to open a canal through the public lands to connect the Wabash river and the Maumee of Lake Erie. By this act, ninety feet of land on each side of the canal was to be reserved, and the use of it given to Indiana for the canal.22 If the canal was not completed in twelve years, or if the land was not used for the purpose of building the canal, the reservation was to be void. Every section of land through which the canal passed was to be reserved for future sale until directed by law.23

In 1826, a bill was brought up granting a certain amount of land to Indiana to aid it in opening this canal.24 Hendricks thought this grant should be made while the country was still largely unsettled and the land worth only $1.25 an acre. Some people thought there was no need of such a grant—that the land along the Wabash should merely be reserved from sale.25 Hendricks showed that this would defeat the very object of the canal, as the country along there which they wanted to settle up would be left a desert. He showed the great importance of the proposed canal. The Wabash he called the "great artery of the Northwest," which Nature had designed to unite the waters of the East and the West.26 It would be of great value in the case of war, for transportation of military supplies and troops from the Mississippi to Upper Canada, or from Upper Canada to the South and West. It would also be of vast importance for commerce, connecting as it would the upper countries around the St. Lawrance with the Mississippi.27

Senator Findlay from Pennsylvania had remarked that Indiana
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was expecting too much. She should be made to build her own canals. The new States were asking for entirely too many laws on the subject of public lands, roads, and canals. Hendricks answered him by saying that this was not the fault of the new States. They had unwisely made a compact with the government not to tax the public lands—hence they had no revenue with which to build roads and canals; furthermore, as the public lands did not belong to them, they could not make laws regarding them, but must leave that to Congress. He ended by saying that Indiana had cheerfully voted for the equipment of war vessels to protect foreign commerce, and should not be considered extravagant because she asked aid in domestic commerce. The bill making this grant was laid on the table at this session, much to Hendricks's disappointment.

The subject was brought up again the next year at the second session of the Nineteenth Congress, 1826-27. A bill was proposed granting six sections of land to aid Indiana in opening the canal. In a speech made February 9, 1827, Hendricks said the objection made last year, that the land was not yet purchased from the Indians, was done away with. A treaty made with the Indians, October 16 and 23, 1826, near the mouth of the Mississinewa river, ceded the land from the Ohio line to the Tippecanoe river north of the Wabash. This treaty had been ratified only a few days before.

Another objection had been, that there were no inhabitants along the line of the canal. Hendricks explained that there was now a settlement at Fort Wayne and the land in the vicinity of the canal would be settled very rapidly from now on. If this grant was made to Indiana, the land given would be sold and thus furnish revenue for the building of the canal. The efforts of Hendricks and other western men were rewarded. A bill approved March 2, 1827, granted land equal to one-half of five sections in width on each side of the canal, reserving each alternate section to the United States. The lands given were to be disposed of by the legislature of Indiana. A stipulation was made that the canal should be commenced in five years. Property of the United States and persons in service of the United States, were to be allowed the use of the canal without paying toll.

The second session of the Nineteenth Congress was also occupied
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with the important question of the public lands. Much of these lands remained unsold after being long in the market. It was thought something should be done to dispose of them. A bill was brought up proposing to graduate the price of lands, so that those remaining unsold March 4, 1827, should be offered for sale after one year, at $1 per acre; those unsold after two years from that date to be sold at 75 cents per acre, and so on until they reached 25 cents an acre; lands unsold for one year after they were offered for 25 cents per acre should be ceded to the States in which they were located. Hendricks proposed an amendment, making the first four sections of the bill apply only to the territories; ceding the public and unappropriated lands to the States in which they lay on condition that they should not put these lands on the market at a lower price than was established by law for the sale of lands in the territories; and providing that the States should hereafter extinguish Indian titles.

In a speech made January 19, 1827, he showed the need of a change in the present land system. As the system was, the lands in the new States belonged to the Federal Government, which had exclusive control of them, established the land offices, and got the revenues coming from them, while the old States owned their public lands, had their own land offices and revenues, and laws made by the legislature regarding them. This, Hendricks claimed, was unfair to the new States. Moreover, Congress had to spend a great deal of time passing laws regarding the public lands in the new States which had better be spent on more important subjects, such as commerce, the army, the navy, and foreign relations. Besides, there was trouble in Congress over the question of internal improvements. Large minorities in both Houses denied the power of Congress to build roads and canals, although by compact with the new States it had pledged 5 per cent. from sale of lands for this purpose.

Early in the next Congress, Hendricks brought up the matter of cession again, presenting a resolution regarding the matter, December 20, 1827. He reinforced his former arguments, saying that the sovereignty, freedom, and independence of the new States were much impaired by the present condition of the public lands. The Federal Government, he said, had no constitutional power to hold the soil of the States except for forts and dockyards, the consent of the State legislature being necessary even then. The States which
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had ceded the lands of the Northwest Territory had intended that States formed from this land should be received into the Union as sovereign and independent States, on an equality with the old States. He also used the argument of secession, saying that public lands in the hands of the general government offered the new States the strongest inducement to the dissolution of the Union, as in that case the land would instantly revert to the States. No bill was presented on this subject.

In the same session, a bill for graduation was again brought up. January 28, 1828, Hendricks offered an amendment providing for the cession of lands to the States, making an extended speech. This bill was rejected April 22, 1828.

The next year, Hendricks presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Indiana regarding cession, asking her Senators to use all their efforts to get a bill passed. Similar resolutions had been presented by Louisiana and Illinois. Another attempt to carry this same matter of graduation and cession through Congress was made in 1830. The General Assembly of Missouri had presented a memorial praying for the passage of such a law. A bill was brought up in the Senate, May 3, and explained by Senator Benton. A new provision was contained in this bill in favor of actual settlers, who could buy lands at each successive graduation for 25 cents less per acre than general purchasers. Provision was also made for donation to poor families without any payments. Hendricks did not like the details of this bill, but was willing to vote for it because it did more than any previous bill toward putting land into the hands of the poor classes, which he regarded as its proper destination. This policy, he thought, would induce the poor of the old States to move to the new. With its failure, Hendricks seems to have given up the struggle to change the land system, which he had carried on for several years.

Hendricks, during his career in the Senate, favored many bills providing for the building of roads. January 10, 1827, he spoke for a House bill providing for the laying out of roads in the Territory of Michigan. General Cass had recommended these roads. They were important because they would go through the country of the Pottawattamies where there was not a single white man living at
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the time. They would cause the country to be settled up quickly.\textsuperscript{35}
The act, approved March 2, 1827, authorized the laying out and opening of roads in Michigan.\textsuperscript{40}

In 1827, January 30, when a bill to appropriate $15,000 for a road in Arkansas from Fort Smith to a place in Louisiana came up, Hendricks favored it, as it was a military road connecting posts on the frontier. The bill was rejected on the ground that it would pass through Louisiana, a sovereign State. Another bill for the construction of a road from Memphis, Tennessee, to Little Rock, Arkansas, was brought up in the Senate a few days later, February 1, 1827. Hendricks offered two amendments authorizing the construction of a road from Fort Smith to Fort Towson on the Red river. The amendments were accepted and the bill was passed, March 3, 1827.\textsuperscript{41}

A bill to authorize the United States to subscribe for stock in the Ohio Turnpike Company was reported in the Senate in 1827. February 17, 1827, Hendricks moved an amendment, proposing a grant of land to Ohio to be used by the State to aid the turnpike company. This amendment was accepted by the Senate and incorporated in the bill, approved March 3, 1827.\textsuperscript{42}

A bill to authorize the subscription to stock in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company came up 1828. May 20, Hendricks spoke in favor of this bill, as he thought this canal would be the means of uniting the feelings and interests of the East and West.\textsuperscript{43} May 24, 1828, a bill was passed, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe to 10,000 shares of stock in the company.

Hendricks did a great deal for the Cumberland Road. In 1828 when the bill for the completion of the road to Zanesville, Ohio, came up in the Senate, Macon of South Carolina offered a resolution that Congress relinquish the road to the States through which it passed, and give up claim to the whole of the 5 per cent. fund reserved from the sale of public lands. Hendricks opposed this resolution, as it would change the compacts which had been made by Congress with the States. He did not think this could be done without the consent of the States, although if he should consult the interests of his own State he would favor this proposition, because if the compacts were relinquished, the public lands would revert to
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the States. Macon's resolution was rejected, and the act for completion of the road to Zanesville was passed May 19, 1828. It appropriated $1,750,000 for this work.

The next year, March 2, an act was passed for opening and making the road west of Zanesville; also an act, March 3, 1829, to appropriate $100,000 for the repair of bridges and walls east of Wheeling. In 1831, Hendricks favored a bill granting the assent of Congress to an act of the Legislature of Ohio for erecting tollgates and providing for the preservation of the road in the State. As the government had refused to erect tollgates, the receipts from which were to be used for repair on the road, Hendricks argued that Ohio should be allowed to do so. If the government refused to repair the road, the problem might be solved by turning the road over to the State. This Hendricks objected to, as it would be a violation of the compact with the States. The matter was finally settled in 1832, when an agreement was made with the legislatures of Maryland, Ohio, and Indiana that they should receive the road as soon as it was repaired.

In 1836, Clay objected to the bill to continue the road in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, saying that it showed favoritism to the North. The country south of the Ohio, he said, was ten times as important as that north, and yet nothing was done for it. Hendricks denied this. He went on to show that the Northwest paid $1,500,000 into the Treasury in 1835 and the South paid not a dollar; the South could tax their lands and the North could not. The North spent millions on roads and canals, making lands more valuable. The South was always dissatisfied because the government helped the North; but Hendricks showed the prosperity of the North was due, not to gifts and grants, but to energetic people, who moved there; to the fertility of the soil, and to the climate. He showed how this road had been the means of settling up the country to a greater extent than any other road; it was the principal thoroughfare of emigration from Eastern States to the Northwest. The road had been finished to Hebron, Ohio, and given up to the States to be preserved and repaired. He urged that appropriations be made to keep it from being injured by delay and neglect. This bill was passed July 2, 1835.
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A matter that Hendricks was much interested in was the navigation of the Wabash. Before 1832, he and Tipton had brought up the subject of the improvement of the Wabash, trying to have it classed with other works of internal improvement. In 1832, they had been successful. Hendricks introduced a bill March 20, 1832, for the improvement of the navigation of the Wabash, which became an item in the Harbor Bill of 1832, and was vetoed by Jackson. So thinking the President had disapproved of this because it was connected with the Harbor Bill, in 1834 Hendricks presented it as a separate bill and it was again vetoed. In 1835, Tipton submitted a resolution regarding the improvement of the Wabash, and a bill was reported for the improvement of rapids below Vincennes by a canal, fifteen miles long. January 2, 1835, the bill was taken up. At this time Hendricks expressed his opinion of Jackson’s views on internal improvements, as very injurious to the prosperity of the Union and especially to the West. He held that the Federal Government should improve rivers, since they were public highways, excluded from public surveys, and could not become the property of the State.

The reason he urged the improvement so strongly was that the canal from the Maumee to the Tippecanoe river was already surveyed and about one-half completed. He thought the rest could be finished by 1837, and he wished the canal made so that navigation would be complete. This bill failed to pass.

The next year practically the same bill was introduced. Hendricks tried to show the importance of the Wabash, which, he said, sent to New Orleans a larger quantity of agricultural products than any other tributary of the Ohio. It was navigable for steamers to the mouth of the Tippecanoe, a distance of five hundred miles. However, there were falls below Vincennes, so that in dry seasons boats could not get out with produce. In 1822, Indiana and Illinois had passed laws authorizing examination of obstructions by engineers of each State. Appropriations had been made later, but the States could not do this themselves. This bill failed. Hendricks again, the next year, 1837, moved an amendment to the Harbor Bill, but it was negatived.

Another work of internal improvements in which Hendricks was interested was the Louisville and Portland Canal at the Falls of the
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Ohio. May 25, 1836, the Committee on Roads and Canals reported a bill authorizing the purchase by the United States of private stock in this canal.\(^5\) Their object was to have the canal belong to the government and be thrown open to free navigation, charging only tolls necessary for repairs.\(^5\) This canal had been built by a company of stockholders in Kentucky. The company charged such heavy tolls that commerce could not endure it and steamboats employed between Louisville and St. Louis paid almost their whole value in one year in tolls.\(^5\) This bill was not passed.

Mr. Hendricks was in favor of a tariff for the encouragement of manufacturing. When the question of the tariff was brought up in 1832, Clay, January 10, presented his resolution to reduce duties on certain imported articles—perfumes, fancy articles, tropical fruits,—not coming into competition with similar articles in the United States.\(^6\) Hendricks made a long speech on this resolution in which he objected to the abolition of duties on articles that were luxuries and used only by people of cities and seaboard. He spoke of the new policy of the government in reducing the revenue for fear of a surplus. He said men of the West had been looking forward to, instead of fearing, a surplus as a means of a permanent and enlarged plan of internal improvements. He would never vote to reduce revenues of the country to the minimum of current expenditures, as it would be farewell to internal improvements and to all hopes of modifying the land system.\(^7\)

In the controversy between Jackson and Congress on the subject of the National Bank, in 1835, Hendricks expressed himself on the need of a national bank as a currency regulator. He preferred a United States Bank located in Washington, as this would do away with constitutional difficulties. The bonus should be distributed among the States in proportion. The Bank should locate branches in the States only by permission of the State Legislatures, and States should be prohibited from taxing the banks.\(^8\)

The distress of this time, Hendricks attributed to the excitement caused by the removal of deposits rather than the removal itself. Hendricks thought the removal was unfortunate, although he did not doubt the power of the President to remove. He had voted against the resolution of censure passed by the Senate on Jackson.

\[^5\]Ibid., p. 1564.
\[^6\]Ibid., p. 1565.
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\[^10\]Ibid., X, p. 1808.
On December 26, 1836, Benton presented a resolution to expunge from the journal the resolution of March 28, 1834, censuring Jackson for having moved the deposits. Hendricks would not vote for the resolution. In a debate, January 16, 1837, he said he thought this resolution had done more harm through exciting party spirit than any other measure that could have been proposed, but he would not consent to its being expunged, as such a power did not exist in the Senate. He was willing to vote in the journal of the present session to rescind the resolution of 1834, but not to obliterate the journal. Daniel Webster sided with Hendricks and voted against the Expunging Resolution.

In 1835, the question of the northern boundary of Ohio occupied some time in the Senate. The northern boundary of the Territory of Indiana had been an east and west line tangent to the southern bend of Lake Michigan. When Indiana was admitted to the Union this line was moved north ten miles in order that the State might have a harbor on the lake. The inhabitants of Michigan Territory resented this action and never conceded its legality. When the question of the northern boundary of Ohio came up in Congress for final settlement, Hendricks proposed as an amendment that the north line of Indiana, as established by the enabling act of 1816, and as surveyed according to an act of Congress dated March 2, 1827, be extended to Lake Erie, to become the northern boundary of Ohio. Michigan claimed to come south to the east and west line through the southern extremity of Lake Michigan, a claim they based on the fifth article of the Ordinance of 1787. Hendricks claimed that by this same article Congress could merge Michigan with Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois. He regarded the chief part of the Territory of Michigan in the peninsula as taken from Indiana. Hendricks's amendment was incorporated in the second section of a bill to establish the northern boundary of Ohio, approved June 23, 1836.

At the first session of the Twenty-Fourth Congress, Mr. Lyon and John Norvell, claiming to be Senators of the United States for Michigan, appeared in the Senate. Benton offered a resolution, December 22, 1835, that they be allowed seats in the Senate as spectators, until the final decision was made as to the admission of Michigan into the Union. Michigan had already asked for admission.

---
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Hendricks objected to this resolution, because Michigan claimed a part of the Territory of Indiana, and with this claim, she could never be admitted to the Union. He offered an amendment to Benton's resolution, providing that the same courtesy be extended to Norvell as a spectator in the Senate, which by the rules of the Senate were extended to the delegates of the territories and members of the House of Representatives. Lyon was already a delegate in the House, so he was not included. Hendricks' resolution was agreed to.  

At the same session, the memorial of Michigan asking to be admitted as a State was presented. Hendricks resisted the pretensions of Michigan, which claimed admission as a sovereign and independent State. He regarded Michigan as having violated the laws of the United States in establishing territorial government in Michigan. This territory had not asked permission of Congress to form a constitution and State government. He thought that they should do this first, or else amend the constitution, adopting proper boundaries.  

At the second session of the Twenty-Third Congress, Hendricks offered a resolution regarding the fixing by law of the time of the commencement and close of the sessions of Congress. The sessions had come to be very long. That of 1831-32 had lasted until July 16; that of 1833-34 until June 30. These long sessions, Hendricks thought, served only to heighten the party strife and national discord, as no more was done than in short sessions. His resolution was agreed to, and a bill reported, fixing the beginning of the session for the first Monday of November, and the day of adjournment of the first session of every Congress for the second Monday in May. This bill was passed by the Senate and House, but vetoed by Jackson, who regarded it as unconstitutional. He regarded the day of adjournment as a question to be settled only by each Congress, although the day of opening could be fixed by law.

During his second term in the Senate, Hendricks served on the Committee on Indian Affairs, on the Committee on Private Land Claims, and from 1832 to 1837, on the Committee on Militia. While on the Committee on Indian Affairs, he showed his acquaint-
ance with the character of Indians. In 1830, January 14, he advocated settling the Miamis and the Pottawatomies west of the Mississippi. The Miamis lived on the south shore of the Wabash. The canal was located through their reservation, and this led to quarrels between the Indians and white men, often ending in bloodshed.

It was Hendricks's practice to issue a circular, near the close of every session, to the people of Indiana, in which he reviewed the work of that session. These were printed in the newspapers of the times. In his circular of June 30, 1836, he discussed the question of surplus revenue, which had come up during the session about to close, July 4. The surplus on hand June 9, 1835, was $33,000,000. It was proposed to get rid of this by distribution among the States, by building fortifications and ships of war, or by the Land Bill. He had voted for the Land Bill, which had passed the Senate. As it was long before the House, and seemed as if it would not pass, he had voted for a distribution among the States.

The question of slavery had come up at this session. Hendricks expressed his opinion of the Abolitionists as misguided in their efforts. "For with the question of slavery, except in the District of Columbia, this government has nothing whatever to do. Slavery in the States is a question belonging exclusively to themselves. Slavery, it must be admitted, is a dangerous and deep-rooted evil in our political system, but it is one for which there seems to be no remedy, and the less the subject is agitated here and elsewhere, the better it is for the peace and welfare of the Union."

In his circular written from Washington, February 14, 1837, Hendricks again discussed the subject of slavery in connection with the agitation about the annexation of Texas. He spoke of the condition of slavery in the South, and the spirit of abolition in the North. "This," he said, "is the rock on which the vessel of the Union is likely to split. Non-slaveholding States have nothing to do with slavery in the Southern States. This is a matter of State regulation altogether." He thought that Texas, whether it was annexed or not, would induce a great slave immigration there, and thus prevent too great an accumulation of slaves further south.

Hendricks's retirement from public life came in 1837, as a result of the overthrow of the Jacksonian party in Indiana by the Harri-
son-Whig upheaval of 1836. As he was about to leave the Senate, Hendricks summed up his public life in Indiana. He said that he had always worked for the interest of his State with zeal, devotion, and fidelity, and ended by saying:

"Whatever may have been the ardor and intensity of my zeal and industry in her service, and of my devotion to her interests; whatever may have been the buffeting of political life, and the fiery ordeal through which I have passed; conscious I am that I shall never cease to owe her a debt of gratitude and one so large that I shall never be able to pay it.

"Neither prosperity nor adversity can ever eradicate those things from my mind, nor separate me in heart and affection from the people of the State. I have seen many days of her prosperity, in which she has grown and flourished like a green bay tree. I have seen many of her important interests arising into existence. Some of them in infancy have been especially committed to my care; some of these have since gained colossal size and strength, and now march forward with irresistible power, overcoming by their own energies everything that comes in their way. Such is the Wabash and Erie Canal, and the Cumberland Road. These were the first important works commenced in our State, and they are still, and ever will be, the main arteries in our system of internal improvements.

"Whilst I shall live to behold the waters of the Mississippi united with those of the Northern Lakes, through the Wabash and Erie Canal, I shall not cease to look back with pride and pleasure to the part it was my lot to bear in giving impulse to that first and most magnificent of our works of internal navigation."

Hendricks was interested in education, and contributed to the support of Indiana University and Hanover College. He helped in many public enterprises. By this interest in many things, as well as through his public service, he was for many years the most popular man in Indiana. He was large and fine looking, with a smile and a warm handshake for every one. His manners were very pleasing. He never did anything to antagonize any one if he could help it.

Hendricks's family was one of the most prominent in the history of Indiana. His eldest son, John Abram, was a captain in the Mex-

---
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ican War, and lieutenant colonel in the Civil War when he was killed at the battle of Pea Ridge. Another son, Thomas, was also killed in this war. A brother and nephew were in the State Senate. Thomas A. Hendricks, Governor of Indiana, United States Senator, and Vice-President of the United States, was a nephew.77

Hendricks died at his farm in Jefferson county, Indiana, May 16, 1850. He had been in feeble health the greater part of the winter and spring, but had recovered enough to attend to his business. On the afternoon of May 16, he had attended a session of the city council, and then went to his farm, where he died of heart disease. He was buried in a vault at Springdale Cemetery, Madison.78

77Voonlen, Sketches of Early Indiana, p. 54.