

Chapter 9 (11-01-11)

Tippecanoe and Slavery Too

What happened to the relationship between
Davis Floyd and Gov. William Henry Harrison?

In 1805 the Indiana Territory transitioned into the second grade of government. Seven men were elected to the House of Representatives and five men were eventually appointed to the Legislative Council. This chapter will examine the period of semi-representative government from 1805 through 1807. It was a period of proslavery activism by Gov. Harrison and his cronies, who adopted several proslavery petitions and passed several slave laws. The anti-slavery forces were silent about these laws maybe because they did not know they had been passed.

First Session of First Indiana Territory General Assembly in 1805

The First Session of the First General Assembly met from July 29th to August 26th, 1805. In the meantime another Act of Congress had been enacted making Wayne County a part of the newly created Michigan Territory. Consequently, Gov. Harrison issued another proclamation reducing the number of the House members from nine to seven. The Indiana Territory now consisted of five counties, three in modern day Indiana, and two in modern day Illinois. The capitol of the Territory was at Vincennes, a central location for the five counties. Floyd took his oath of office on the first day of the session along with three other members. Six members of the House attended the first day. The seventh member showed up on the second day.

Rev. Lemen's Diary Entries

On May 4th, 1805 at New Design in the Illinois country Rev. Lemen wrote in his diary:

At our last meeting, as I expected he would do, Gov. Harrison asked and insisted that I should cast my influence for the introduction of slavery here, but I not only denied the request, but I informed him that the evil attempt would encounter my most active opposition in every possible and honorable manner that my mind could suggest or my means accomplish.

Dunn, *Indiana and Indianans*, Vol. I, The American Historical Society, Chicago and New York, 1919, p. 248.

A few days later on May 10, 1805 he wrote:

Knowing President Jefferson's hostility against the introduction of slavery here [Indiana Territory] and the mission he sent me on to oppose it, I do not believe the pro-slavery petitions with which Gov. Harrison and his council are pressing Congress for slavery here can prevail while he is President, as he is very popular with Congress and will find means to over-reach the evil attempt of the pro-slavery power.

Dunn, *Indiana and Indianans*, Vol. I, The American Historical Society, 1919, p. 248.

Requirements for Enactment of Laws during Grade Two

Part of Section 11 of the Northwest Ordinance provided "...the governor, legislative council, and house of representatives, shall have authority to make laws in all cases, for the good government of the district, not repugnant to the principles and articles in this ordinance established and declared. And all bills, having passed by a majority in the house, and by a majority in the council, shall be referred to the governor for his assent, but no bill, or legislative act whatever, shall be of any force without his assent. The governor shall have the power to convene, prorogue [adjourn], and dissolve the general assembly, when, in his opinion, it shall be expedient." Apparently, Gov. Harrison did not read this last

sentence or he could have “dissolved” the General Assembly upon any whim, or maybe he did without telling anyone.

Appointment of Indiana Territory House of Representative Committee in 1805

On August 1st, 1805, a motion was passed in the Territorial House of Representatives to appoint a committee “to examine into the propriety of enlarging the privilege of introducing Bond servants of colour into the Territory from any states or Territories in the U. States....” Benjamin Parke, who served in the Territory’s House of Representatives in the First General Assembly (1805 and 1806) as one of Knox County’s representatives, and Floyd were appointed to this committee. Parke also served on two other committees on which Floyd served. According to the *Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana Territory, 1805-1815*, pp. 999-1002, Parke is sketched as a Harrison man and “while in Congress [he] supported memorials from the Territory praying suspension of the sixth article of the Ordinance [of 1787] (the article prohibiting slavery) for ten years....” Parke had trained as a lawyer in Kentucky and was admitted to practice law in the Indiana Territory in 1802. On August 4th, 1804 Harrison named him as the Territory’s attorney general. After that he served as the Territorial delegate to the U. S. Congress from December 12th, 1805, to April 22nd, 1808. It cannot be ascertained at this time whether Harrison intended to appoint two proslavery men to the committee or one of each. After serving as the Territory’s Attorney General and Congressional Delegate, Parke served as a Judge of the Territory’s General Court from April 22nd, 1808, until December 11th, 1816, when Indiana became a state.

1805 Indiana Territorial Legislative Memorial Favoring Slavery

Two bizarre things happened during the First Session of the 1805 legislature in which Floyd served. First, there is in the *Journals of the General Assembly of*

Indiana Territory 1805-1815, for that period a copy of a petition to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives dated August 19th, 1805 from the Indiana Territory Legislative Council and House of Representatives signed by Jesse B. Thomas from Dearborn County, George Fisher from Randolph County, and Parke, from Knox County. All three of them were proslavery men. The petition said in its address to Congress that it constituted "a majority of the two houses respectively." The pertinent parts of the 1805 petition said:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, the petition of the subscribers, members of the Legislative Council and House of Representatives of the Indiana Territory, and constituting a majority of the two Houses respectively, humbly sheweth

That inasmuch as there are several subjects of legislation, material to the present and future interests of the Indiana Territory which are under the control of Congress only, they think it prudent and Just in relation to their constituents and themselves to state them for the consideration of your honorable body.

In the first place we would submit the propriety of the introduction of slaves into this Territory. It is not from a sordid motive or one that springs merely from a view to the present circumstances and situation of this Country, that they urge the adoption of the measure but they consider the subject upon principles of Justice and policy—Justice in relation to slaves and policy as it regards the Southern states. The slaves that are possessed south of the Potomac render the future peace and tranquility of those states highly problematical. Their numbers are too great to effect either an immediate or a gradual simultaneous emancipation. They regret the African that was first landed in the Country and could wish that the invidious distinction between freemen and slaves was obliterated in the United States. But however repugnant it may be to their feelings, or to the principles of a republican form of Government, it was entailed upon them by those over whose conduct they had no control. The evil was planted in the Country when the domination of England overruled the honest exertions of their fellow-citizens, it is too deeply rooted to be easily eradicated, and it now rather becomes a question of policy, in what way the slaves are to be disposed of, that they may be least injurious to the Country and by which their hapless condition may be ameliorated. When they are herded together by hundred they cannot

be as comfortably provided for as if they were scattered in small numbers on farms. That a removal to the Western Territories would relieve them from many of the hardships and inconveniences to which they are now subjected they appeal to their situation in the northern parts of the states of Maryland and Virginia and the States of Kentucky and Tennessee. They do not conceive that the greatest influx of immigrants would increase the number of blacks to such a degree as to render them in the least dangerous to the future interests of the Territory and with submission they would suggest that dispersing them through the Western Territories is the only means by which a gradual emancipation can ever be effected.

The Western Territories are immense, their situation inviting, emigration astonishingly great, the population west of the Ohio must chiefly be derived from the Southern and Western States where slaves are most numerous and if no restrictions were imposed but holder and possessors of blacks permitted to remove them wherever whim or caprice might dictate, they would venture to predict that in less than a century the colour would be so disseminated as to be scarcely discoverable....

Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana Territory 1805-1815, Indiana Historical Collections, Volume XXXII, pp. 101-103.

The essence of this memorial was that slavery should be allowed in Indiana to reduce the overcrowding of Negroes in the South and that intermarriage with whites in the Territory would dilute the skin color of blacks. Footnotes in the *Journals* at this point say:

This memorial was not adopted by the General Assembly as an official part of its proceedings, though the committee of the United States House of Representatives to which it was referred spoke of it as the “petition of the Legislative Council and House of Representatives of said Territory.” It received approval of only three members of the House, Johnson, Fisher, and Parke. Floyd an outright antislavery man would not support it....

The U. S. House committee to which this petition was referred reacted favorably, their report concluding with the resolution that the sixth article of the Ordinance which prohibited slavery in Indiana Territory be suspended for ten years “so as to permit the introduction of slaves, born within the United States, from any of the individual States.”

John Johnson from Knox County was identified in this footnote as one of the signers rather than Jesse B. Thomas also from Knox County. It appears that the 1805 petition was signed by only three members of the House of Representatives be it Thomas or Johnson. It was never approved by a majority of either the Legislative Council or the House of Representatives. Even though the First Session of the First General Assembly started on July 29th, 1805 and lasted until August 26th, the *Journals* break off on August 17th. Therefore, there is no recorded memorandum of any discussion or action on the petition at least in the *Journals*.

Author Dunn had the following to say about this memorial:

The territorial House refused to adopt this petition, but their action was not due to the anti-slavery sentiments of the members, for the only one of them who was not a pro-slavery man was Davis Floyd of Clark. A majority of the constituency of Jesse B. Thomas of Dearborn [County] were anti-slavery at this time, but the line had not been sharply drawn on this question at the late election there. He had no firmly fixed principles on the subject, and on this occasion had no vote, being the speaker of the House.

Dunn, *Indiana--A Redemption from Slavery*, p.337.

Two years later the Clark County Antislavery Committee would have the following to say about these actions of the Territorial legislature:

In the year 1805, the subject was again taken up and discussed in the General Assembly, and a majority of the House of Representatives voted against said memorial on the aforesaid subject [slavery], and, consequently the memorial was rejected, as the journals of that house doth sufficiently evince; but a number of citizens thought proper to sign the same, and, amongst the rest, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Council, (though the President of the Council denies ever having signed the same;) and, by

some legislative legerdemain it found its way into the Congress of the United States, as the legislative act of the Territory.

Philbrick, *The Laws of the Indiana Territory 1801-1809*, p. 519.

This was the first instance of a proslavery petition in the Indiana Territory being transmitted to the U. S. Congress as the duly constituted action of the legislature when in fact it was not.

1805 Law for Introduction of Negroes and Mulattoes into Territory

The second bizarre thing that happened during the session was the apparent passage of a law concerning the introduction of Negroes and Mulattoes into the Territory. This law was approved on August 26, 1805 and was signed by Jesse B. Thomas as Speaker of the House of Representatives, by Benjamin Chambers as President of the Council both from Dearborn County, and by Gov. Harrison. The first section of the law provided as follows:

AN ACT concerning the introduction of Negroes and Mulattoes into this Territory.

1. Be it enacted by the Legislative Council and House of Representatives, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That it shall and may be lawful for any person being the owner or possessor of any negroes or mulattoes of and above the age of fifteen years, and owing service and labour (sic) as slaves in either of the states or territories of the United States, or for any citizen of the said states or territories purchasing the same, to bring the said negroes or mulattoes into this territory.

The next three sections of the law contained an interesting twist which was probably an attempt to remove this 1805 law from the proscription of Article 6 of the 1787 Ordinance. Section 2, 3, and 4 provided as follows:

2. That the owner or possessor of any negroes or mulattoes, as aforesaid, and bringing the same into this territory, shall within thirty days after such removal, go with the same before the clerk of the court

of common pleas of the proper county, and in the presence of the said clerk the said owner or possessor shall determine and agree to and with his or her negro or mulatto upon the terms of years which the said negro or mulatto will and shall serve his or her said owner or possessor, and the said clerk is hereby authorized and required to make a record thereof, in a book which he shall keep for the purpose.

3. That if any negro or mulatto removed into this territory as aforesaid, shall refuse to serve his or her owner as aforesaid, it shall and may be lawful for such person within sixty days thereafter, to remove said negro or mulatto to any place, which by the laws of the United States, or territory from whence such owner or possessor may or shall be authorized to remove the same.

4. That if any person or persons shall neglect or refuse to perform the duty required in the second [section], or to take advantage of the benefit of the preceding section hereof, within the time therein respectively prescribed, such person or persons, shall forfeit all claim and right whatever, to the service and labour [sic], of such negroes or mulattoes.

These sections in the 1805 law attempted to do the same thing as the 1803 law. It was a subterfuge to change the status of a slave coming into the Indiana Territory from that of involuntary servitude to voluntary. Again the motive must have been to avoid the proscription against involuntary servitude in the Ordinance. However, the 1805 law contained another section which did not satisfy the proscription. That section provided as follows:

5. That any person removing into this territory, and being the owner or possessor of any negro or mulatto as aforesaid, under the age of fifteen years, or if any person shall hereafter acquire a property in any negro or mulatto under the age aforesaid, and who shall bring them into this territory, it shall and may be lawful for such person, owner or possessor, to hold the said negro or mulatto to service and labour (sic), the males, until they arrive at the age of thirty five, and the females, until they arrive at the are of thirty two years.

As to such Negroes and mulattoes, they entered the Territory as slaves and remained slaves in involuntary servitude until they reached the indicated ages which in most instances would be very difficult for them to prove. The rest of the law read as follows:

6. Any person removing any negro or mulatto into this territory under the authority of the preceding sections, it shall be incumbent on such person within thirty days thereafter, to register the name and age of such negro or mulatto, with the clerk of the court of common pleas of the proper county.

7. That if any person shall remove any negro or mulatto from one county to another county with this territory, who may or shall be brought into the same under the authority of either the first or fifth sections hereof, it shall be incumbent on such person to register the same, and also the name and age of the said negro or mulatto with the said clerk of the county from whence, and to which such negro or mulatto may be removed within thirty days after such removal.

8. That if any person shall neglect or refuse to perform the duty required by the two preceding sections hereof, such person for such offence, shall be fined in the sum of fifty dollars, to be recovered by indictment or information, and for the use of the proper county.

9. That is any clerk shall neglect or refuse to perform the duty and service herein required, he shall for every such neglect or refusal be fined in the sum of 50 dollars to be recovered by the information and indictment & for the use of the county.

10. And be it further enacted, That is shall be the duty of the clerk of the court of common pleas aforesaid, when any person shall apply to him to register any mulatto or negro agreeably to the preceding section to demand and receive the said applicant's bond with sufficient security in the penalty of five hundred dollars, payable to the governor and his successor in office, conditioned that the said mulatto or negro, or mullattoes or negroes as the case may be, shall not after the expiration of his or her time of service become a county charge, which bond shall be lodged with the county treasurers respectively, for the use of the said counties; provided always, that no such bond shall be required or requirable in case the time of service of such negro or mulatto shall expire before he or she arrives at the age of forty years, if such negro or mulatto, be at that time capable, him or herself, by his or her own labour.

11. Any person who shall forcibly take or carry out of this territory, or who shall be aiding or assisting therein, any person or persons, owing, or having owed service or labour, without the consent of such person or persons, previously obtained before any judge of the court of common pleas, of the county where such person owing, or having owed such service or labour resides, which consent shall be certified by said judge of the common pleas, to the clerk of the court of the court of common pleas where he resides, at, or before the next court, any person so offending, upon conviction thereof, shall forfeit and pay one thousand dollars, one third to the use of the county, and two thirds to the sue of the person so taken or carried away, to be recovered by action of debt, or one the case; Provided, That there shall be nothing in this section so construed, as to prevent any master or mistress form removing any person owing service or labour from this territory, as described in the third section of this act.

12. That the said clerk, for every registry made in manner aforesaid, shall receive seventy five cents from the applicant therefor.

13. And be it further enacted, That children born in this territory of parent of colour, owning service or labor by indenture according to law, shall serve the master or mistress of such parent, the males, until the age of thirty, and the females, until the age of twenty eight years.

14. And be it further enacted, That the provisions contained in a law of this territory respecting apprentices, and passed at this session of the legislature, shall be in force as to such children in case of the misbehaviour of the master or mistress, or for cruelty or ill usage. This act shall be in force from the passage thereof.

JESSE B. THOMAS, Speaker of the House
of Representatives

B. CHAMBERS, President of the Council.

Approved August 26th, 1805.

William Henry Harrison.

Philbrick, *The Laws of Indiana Territory 1801-1809*, pp. 136-139.

Badollet's Antislavery Response to 1805 Petition Favoring Slavery

Badollet responded to the 1805 petition in an August 31st, 1805 letter to Gallatin:

The introduction of Slavery into the Territory continues to be the Hobby horse of influential men here. The members of the legislature have signed a petition to Congress praying for some reasonable modification to the ordinance, but this favorite topic of Slavery, will I trust meet with a general disapprobation in Congress. Shallow politicians, who to obtain a temporary good are willing to entail on their Country a permanent evil.

Thornbrough and Riker, *The Correspondence of John Badollet and Albert Gallatin 1804-1836*, p.49.

There is no record after August 17th who voted on the petition and the law because those parts of the Territorial records are missing. It becomes clear at this point that Floyd was an antislavery man. No *Journal* records show that he, or anyone else for that matter, voted for or against the memorial or the law. However, Floyd's position on the 1805 proslavery petition is made perfectly clear in the counter-petition filed with Congress in 1807 by the Clark County Antislavery Committee.

Who would have been in the best position to know what went on during the First Session of the First General Assembly than Floyd as Clark County's sole representative to that legislative body? The counter-petition claimed that a majority of the House voted against the proslavery petition and that the *Journals* verify this action. But those are the very parts of the *Journals* which are now missing. Were they destroyed by the proslavery forces to hide their intrigues? Floyd would have been in the best position to know what went on in the General Assembly during the summer of 1805. But did he know anything about the 1805 law? That remains a mystery.

Davis Floyd: "Outright Antislavery Man"

A footnote in the *Journals* describes Floyd as an "outright antislavery man" who "would not support" slavery. (see *Journals*, p. 102) Therefore, the evidence is suggestive that Floyd was an antislavery man in 1802 and it is overwhelming

that Floyd had become an antislavery man at least by the summer of 1805. He was still Sheriff at that time and probably incurred the ire of Harrison.

Badollet's 1806 Antislavery Letter to Gallatin

Badollet touches on the slavery issue again in a post script to a letter to Gallatin dated January 1, 1806, from Vincennes:

I will I suppose end my days here, provided the inhabitants, when arrived at the third grade of government [statehood] do not admit the odious system of slavery, on account of which they betray the greatest uneasiness, they have brought from the Southern States their prejudices & fondness for that nefarious system, that measure would perhaps be attended with a few transitory & present advantages, but would entail on the country serious & permanent evils.

Thornbrough, *The Correspondence of John Badollet and Albert Gallatin 1804-1836*, p. 64.

Badollet did not mention the slavery issue again in his letters to Gallatin for two and one-half years.

Rev. Lemen's Diary Entry

On January 20th, 1806, Rev. Lemen entered the following note in his diary at New Design:

As Gov. William Henry Harrison and his legislative council have had their petitions before Congress several sessions asking for slavery here, I sent a messenger to Indiana to ask the churches and people there to get up and sign a counter petition to Congress to uphold freedom in the territory and I have circulated one here and we will send it on to that body at next session or as soon as the work is done.

Dunn, *Indiana and Indianans*, Vol. I, The American Historical Society, Chicago and New York, 1919, pp. 248-248.

1806 Letter from Judge Davis to U. S. Attorney General

In his book entitled *Mr. Jefferson's Hammer--William Henry Harrison and the Origins of American Indian Policy*, the author says:

Anti-slavery sentiment was not necessarily pro-African American; in fact, it was often quite the contrary. Many whites opposed slavery simply because they did not want blacks around. In 1806, Indiana's Judge Thomas T. Davis had made an anti-slavery (and anti-African American) plea to U.S. attorney general John Breckenridge: "If you have any influence for God's sake dont let Congress introduce Slavery among us. I dispise the Colour & Situation & if Congress will let us alone we will in Two years become a state. But if they Humor the St. Vincennes party they will have the whole Territory in Confusion. Let us alone and we will do well."

Robert M. Owens, *Mr. Jefferson's Hammer--William Henry Harrison and the Origins of American Indian Policy*, University of Oklahoma Press, 2007, p.192.

It is not obvious what Judge Davis was trying to say in his letter to the Attorney General when he said he despised (or hated) the "Colour & Situation." Author Owens jumps to the conclusion that it was a racist remark, or as he describes it, "Negrophobia," when it probably meant the circumstances in which black slaves found themselves in slave-holding states. Davis makes it clear to the Attorney General that he is against the introduction of slavery into the Territory and that if Congress humors "the St. Vincennes party" (Harrison and his cronies) the whole Territory will be in uncertainty. Nothing in the Indiana proslavery and antislavery documents on which this book focuses provides any support for Author Owens' statement. Judge Davis had represented Mercer County, Kentucky, in the state legislature in that state in 1795-1797 and represented Kentucky in Congress from 1797 to 1803, when he was named judge in the Indiana Territory. He was a Free Mason and his widow would end up marrying Floyd in 1809 and accompanying him to Florida in 1823 when he was appointed land commissioner there. Further, he was the judge in Jeffersonville who presided over Floyd's trial as a result of the latter's involvement with Aaron Burr, in which some think Floyd received a very light sentence. There is nothing to suggest that Gov. Harrison and his proslavery supporters were negrophobes. In

fact, just the opposite is suggested in the 1805 petition set out above which recited "They [the petitioners] regret the African that was first landed in the Country and could wish that the invidious distinction between freeman and slaves was obliterated in the United States." It seems more likely when Judge Davis mentioned he despised the "Colour & Situation," he was referring to such a regret. The petition also recited "It is not a sordid motive or one that springs merely from a view to the present circumstances and situation of this country, that they urge the adoption of the measure [the introduction of slaves into the Territory] but they consider the subject upon principles of Justice and policy-- Justice in relation to slaves and policy as it relates to the Southern states." "Circumstances and situation" in this context equates to "Colour & Situation" in Judge Davis' letter. Further, there is no evidence that Floyd, Badollet, or the Beggs brothers, were negrophobes.

Owens may have gotten something else wrong. Referring to the first session of the First General Assembly in 1805, he says

When the representatives from Clark and Dearborn counties arrived, they were told, Morrison asserted, that since they had arrived late, they could take their seats only if they approved the nominations for the Legislative Council. (Had Morrison known that President Jefferson had let Harrison choose his own council, he would have been even more incensed.) The representative from Clark County, "being a man of integrity and talents," nearly resigned on the spot but was persuaded to take his seat: "This I hope will be considered as a Sufficient a Pology [sic] for Sending P.[arke] to Congress, When you reflect that, he himself was one of the three that Sent him."

Owens, Mr. Jefferson's Hammer--William Henry Harrison and the Origins of American Indian Policy, p. 94.

He cites in a footnote as authority for the foregoing paragraph a letter from Robert Morrison to Joseph Morrison dated December 31, 1805. That footnote says:

Robert Morrison to Joseph Morrison, December 31, 1805, Manuscripts, Robert Morrison Papers, SC1079, Illinois State Historical Library. Morrison is likely referring to William Biggs, who was initially pro-slavery but also in favor of dividing Indiana Territory. The other representative from Clark County was Davis Floyd, an ally of Harrison's. See Philbrick, ed., *Laws of Indiana Territory*, ccxlix-ccl.

Owens, *Mr. Jefferson's Hammer--William Henry Harrison and the Origins of American Indian Policy*, Footnote 76, p. 265.

Floyd was the only duly elected member of the 1805-1806 Indiana Territory House of Representatives from Clark County. William Biggs was elected to the House on May 21st, 1805, and served with Floyd. Biggs was from St. Clair County in the Illinois country and represented that county and not Clark County. The man whom Robert Morrison was describing in his letter could only be Davis Floyd, not William Biggs. And by this time Floyd was not an ally of Harrison either.

There are other recorded instances of negrophobia in the Indiana Territory. Author Thornbrough mentions other such events in her book entitled *The Negro in Indiana before 1900* when she says "The migration of free Negroes into the Territory was regarded with disfavor by most of the whites," and then cites a petition sent to Congress in 1813 by Harrison County citizens who said:

We are opposed to the introduction of slaves or free Negroes in any shape...Our corn Houses, Kitchens, Smoke Houses...may no doubt be robbed and our wives, children and daughters may and no doubt will be insulted and abused by those African. We feel for our property, wives and daughters. We do not wish to be saddled with them in any way.

Emma Lou Thornbrough, *The Negro in Indiana before 1900*, The Indiana Historical Bureau, 1985, Indiana University Press, 1993, p. 20.

She goes on to say that there were attempts in the Territorial General Assembly in 1813-1815 to bar free Negroes from coming into the Territory although these attempts admittedly failed. Further, laws were enacted which denied the vote and military service to Negroes. There is no doubt that some, not most, Territorial citizens disliked African Americans and did not want them around whether they were slaves or free. Nevertheless, the Territory went on record as opposing the institution of slavery and that was a big step.

1806 Congressional Report Favoring Slavery

However, shortly after Badollet's January 1st, 1806, letter to Gallatin, another committee of Congress issued another communication to Congress. This communication was dated February 14th, 1806. The communication said as follows:

Mr. Garnett, from the committee to whom were referred the report of a select committee, made on the 17th day of February, 1804, on a letter of William Henry Harrison, president of a convention held at Vincennes, in the Indiana Territory, declaring the consent of the people of the said Territory to a suspension of the sixth article of compact between the United States and the said people; also on a memorial and petition of the inhabitants of the said Territory; also on the petition of the Legislative Council and House of Representatives of the said Territory; together with the petition of certain purchasers of land, settled and intending to settle on that part of the Indiana Territory west of Ohio, and east of the boundary line running from the mouth of the Kentucky river; and on two memorials from the inhabitants of Randolph and St. Clair--made the following report:

That, having attentively considered the facts stated in the said petitions and memorials, they are of the opinion that a qualified suspension, for a limited time, of the sixth article of compact between the original States and the people and States west of the river Ohio, would be beneficial to the people of the Indiana Territory. The suspension of this article is an object almost universally desired in that Territory. It appears to your committee to be a question entirely different from that between slavery and freedom, inasmuch as it would merely occasion the removal of persons, already slaves, from one part of the country to another. The good effects of this

suspension, in the present instance, would be to accelerate the population of that Territory, hitherto retarded by the operation of that article of compact, as slave-holders emigrating into the Western country might then indulge any preference which they might feel for a settlement in the Indiana Territory, instead of seeking, as they are now compelled to do, settlements in other States or countries permitting the introduction of slaves. The condition of the slaves themselves would be much ameliorated by it, as it is evident, from experience, that the more they are separated and diffused, the more care and attention are bestowed on them by their masters, each proprietor having it in his power to increase their comforts and conveniences in proportion to the smallness of their numbers. The dangers, too, (if any are to be apprehended,) from too large a black population existing in any one section of country, would certainly be very much diminished, if not entirely removed. But whether dangers are to be feared from this source or not, it is certainly an obvious dictate of sound policy to guard against them, as far as possible. If this danger does exist, or there is any cause to apprehend it, and our Western brethren are not only willing but desirous to aid us in taking precautions against it, would it not be wise to accept their assistance. We should benefit ourselves, without injuring them, as their population must always so far exceed any black population which can ever exist in that country, as to render the idea of danger from that source chimerical...

After attentively considering the various objects desired in the memorials and petitions, the committee respectfully submit to the House the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That the sixth article of the ordinance of 1787, which prohibits slavery within the Indiana Territory, be suspended for ten years, so as to permit the introduction of slaves, born within the United States, from any of the individual States....

American States Papers, Misc., Vol. 1, 1789-1809, No. 203 at p. 450.

James Mercer Garnett was a Democratic-Republican from Virginia. He would later serve on the grand jury who decided the case on treason against Aaron Burr. Again, Congress took no action on this communication.

Second Session of First General Assembly/1806 Proslavery Resolutions

As previously indicated two bizarre things had happened during the First Session of the First General Assembly. The Second Session of the First General Assembly started on November 3rd, 1806 and ended on December 6th, 1806. Parke had resigned from the House when he was elected territorial delegate to Congress in the previous year; he was replaced by Jacob Kuykendall. The rest of the membership of the House remained the same with Floyd continuing to represent Clark County. During this Second Session another bizarre thing happened. Undated resolutions were passed and signed by Speaker Thomas and President pro tem of the Legislative Council, Pierre Menard from Randolph County, which provided as follows:

Resolved, unanimously, by the Legislative Council and House of Representatives of the Indiana Territory, That a suspension of the sixth article of compact between the United States, and the Territories and States northwest of the river Ohio, passed the 13th of July, 1787, for the term on ten years, would be highly advantageous to the said Territory, and meet the approbation of at least nine-tenths of the good citizens of the same.

Resolved, unanimously, That the abstract question of liberty and slavery is not considered as involved in a suspension of the said article, inasmuch, as the number of slaves in the United States would not be augmented by the measure.

Resolved, unanimously, That the suspension of the said article would be equally advantageous to the Territory, to the States from whence the negroes would be brought and to the negroes themselves.

To the Territory because of its situation with regard to the other States, it must be settled by emigrants from those in which slavery is tolerated, or for many years remain in its present situation, its citizens deprived of the greater part of their political rights, and indeed, of all those which distinguish the American from the citizens and subjects of other Governments.

The States which are overburdened with negroes would be benefited by their citizens having an opportunity of disposing of the negroes which they cannot comfortably support, or of removing with them to a country abounding with all the necessaries of life; and the negro himself would exchange a scanty pittance of the coarsest for a plentiful and nourishing diet, and a situation which admits not the most distant prospect of emancipation, for one which presents no considerable obstacle to his wishes.

Resolved, unanimously, That the citizens of this part of the former Northwestern Territory consider themselves as having claims upon the indulgence of Congress, in regard to a suspension of the said article, because at the time of the adoption of the ordinance of 1787 slavery was tolerated, and slaves generally possessed by the citizens then inhabiting the country, amounting to at least one half of the present population of Indiana, and because the said ordinance was passed in Congress when the said citizens were not represented in that body, without their being consulted, and without their knowledge and approbation.

Resolved, unanimously, That from the situation, soil, climate, and productions of the territory, it is not believed that the number of slaves would ever bear such proportion to the white population as to endanger the internal peace and prosperity of this country.

Resolved, unanimously, that copies of these resolutions be delivered to the Governor of this Territory, to be by him forwarded to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, with a request that they will lay the same before the Senate and House of Representatives, over which they respectively preside.

Resolved, unanimously, That a copy of these resolutions be delivered to the delegate to Congress from this Territory, and that he be, and he hereby is, instructed to use his best endeavors to obtain a suspension of the said article.

**Jesse B. Thomas, Speaker of the
House of Representatives
Pierre Menard, President *pro tem*
of the Legislative Council**

Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana Territory 1805-1815, pp. 123-124.

A lot happened to Davis Floyd between the end of the Second Session of the First General Assembly on December 6th, 1806 and the start of the First Session of the Second General Assembly on August 17th, 1807. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark had returned from their expedition to the Western waters, had come through Louisville on their way east, and on November 8, 1806 had dinner at Locust Grove with its owner, William Croghan, and with Clark's brothers, Generals George Rogers Clark and Jonathan Clark. Mr. Croghan's wife, Lucy, who was the sister of the three Clark brothers, would have also been present. It

is possible that Floyd was at Locust Grove on that occasion, eager to find out more about the death of his younger brother, Sgt. Charles Floyd, who died during the first summer of the Expedition. In the meantime Floyd had met Aaron Burr at the home of his Jeffersonville friend, the previously mentioned Judge Davis; had invested with Burr and others in a proposal to build a canal around the Falls of the Ohio on the Indiana side; and had joined his expedition which would later go down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. In 1806 Floyd became Burr's quartermaster and had mustered men, boats, and supplies in Louisville to make the journey downriver. In 1807 he was arrested with Burr in the Mississippi Territory and charged with the same crimes that Burr and others were charged. He was either released or escaped back to Indiana and pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor crime for his participation in the so-called conspiracy. Even with these horrendous events in Floyd's life he was elected clerk of the House of Representatives for the Second General Assembly for 1807. Floyd was replaced by James Beggs as Clark County's member to the House of Representatives. Samuel Gwathmey remained Clark County's member to the Legislative Council. General Washington Johnston from Knox County had just been elected to the House of Representatives to represent that County. Mr. Johnston's name was General Washington; he was not a military general. He was Davis Floyd's brother-in-law, Floyd having married his sister, a widow, Susanna Johnston Lewis, on February 14th, 1794, in Louisville.

Floyd was elected clerk three days after his conviction for aiding in setting foot a military expedition against the King of Spain with whom the United States was then at peace, a misdemeanor. There is no evidence of any immediate reaction to these events although the October 3rd and November 17th, 1807 issues of the *Western Sun*, a newspaper in Vincennes, published letters from General Washington Johnston and Luke Decker defending Floyd's election as clerk. During his service in the House of Representatives in 1807, 1808, and 1809 Decker was pro-slavery, pro-Harrison, and against the division of the Territory.

But then on November 25th and December 16th, 1807, and on March 23rd, 1808, letters signed the "Broken Blunderbus" in the *Western Sun* questioned Floyd's election as clerk. The last letter went further and denounced his election as clerk. On January 4th, 1808 a meeting of the citizens of Knox County took place for taking "into consideration the appointment of Davis Floyd Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to remove the Odium which has been cast upon the people of the Territory in consequence of that Appointment." The resolutions adopted at that meeting failed to criticize Judge Davis who was thought to have handed out a light sentence to Floyd but they did denounce the Legislature for Floyd's election as clerk. By this time Floyd had completed his term as clerk in the First Session of the Second General Assembly which lasted from August 17th to September 19th, 1807. He did not resign from his clerk position until early 1808.

Early 1807 Congressional Committee Report Favoring Slavery

On February 12th, 1807 Parke, the Indiana delegate to Congress and chairperson of the House committee to whom a letter from Gov. Harrison and certain resolutions were referred, made a report favorable to the ten-year suspension of Article 6 to the Ordinance of 1787. A footnote in the *Journals* at p.124 stated that they were read in the U. S. house on January 20th and in the Senate on January 21st, 1807. That report said as follows:

Mr. Parke, from the committee to whom was referred the letter of William Henry Harrison, Governor of the Indiana Territory, enclosing certain resolutions of the Legislative Council and House of Representatives of the said Territory, made the following report.

That the resolutions of the Legislative Council and House of Representatives of the Indiana Territory relate to a suspension, for a term of ten years, of the sixth article of compact between the United States and the Territories and States northwest of the river Ohio, passed the 13th July, 1787. That article declares "there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory."

The suspension of the said article would operate an immediate and essential benefit to the Territory, as emigration to it will be inconsiderate for many years, except from those States where slavery is tolerated; and although it is not considered expedient to force the population of the Territory, yet it is desirable to connect its scattered interior situation of the Territory, it is not believed that slaves would ever become so numerous as to endanger the internal peace or future prosperity of the country. The current of emigration flowing to the western country, the Territories ought all to be opened to their introduction. The abstract question of liberty and slavery is not involved in the proposed measure, as slavery now exists to a considerable extent in different parts of the Union; it would not augment the number of slaves, but merely authorize the removal to Indiana of such as are held in bondage in the United States. If slavery is an evil, means ought to be devised to render it least dangerous to the community, and by which the hapless situation of the slaves would be most ameliorated; and to accomplish these objects, no measure would be so effectual as the one proposed. The committee, therefore, respectfully submit to the House the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to suspend, from and after the 1st day of January, 1808, the sixth article of compact between the United States and the Territories and States northwest of the river Ohio, passed the 13th day of July, 1787, for the term of ten years.

American State Papers, Misc., Vol. 1, 1789-1809, p. 477.

This report supported the suspension through a rather bizarre argument. First, slaves would only come to Indiana from other slave states. Second, these slaves would only populate the interior portions of the Territory but not enough to cause any problems in those areas. Third, the flow of slaves into all Territories should be open. Fourth, and perhaps the most ridiculous, is that the "abstract question of liberty and slavery" is not part of the issue since slavery exists in a number of states and there would be no increase in the number of slaves in the country. And fifth, by spreading slavery into non-slave areas, slaves would be less dangerous to the country. Parke, the Indiana Territory's Delegate to the U. S. House of Representatives, made this argument. He was Harrison's proslavery puppet. Fortunately, Congress never acted on the resolution.

End of Slave Trade in the United States and its Territories

On March 2nd, 1807 Congress passed legislation outlawing the importation of slaves to the United States. It is not unlikely that this legislation emboldened the anti-slavery men in Indiana. The new law read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That from and after the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and eight, it shall not be lawful to import or bring into the United States or any territories thereof from any foreign kingdom, place, or country, any negro, mulatto, or person of colour, as a slave, or to be held to service or labor.

An Act to Prohibit the Importation of Slaves into Any Port or Place Within the Jurisdiction of the United States, From and After the First Day of January, in the Year of our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Eight, March 2, 1807

In the same year England's Parliament enacted a law that made it unlawful for any English ship to engage in the slave trade. The English courts had previously ruled in 1772 that slaves became free in England as soon as they stepped foot on its soils. Although slavery was abolished in England at that time it was still allowed in its colonies where slave trade was also permitted.

Gov. Harrison's Letter to Gov. Williams, Governor of the Mississippi Territory

On April 3rd, 1807 Gov. Harrison wrote the following letter to Gov. Williams, Governor of the Mississippi Territory, concerning Floyd, only a part of which letter is reproduced here:

Dr Sir

Mr. Davis Floyd...has requested me to write you in his favor, and to State his Standing and Character in this Territory before his late expedition [Burr's filibuster]. I have been intimately acquainted with this Gentleman for Six Years [since 1801] and I can truly affirm that there was not a man in the Territory, who possessed more intirely my Confidence & esteem, As sheriff of the County in which he resided,

Representative in the Legislature and an Officer in the Militia, (in which he held the rank of Major) his conduct was equally honorable to himself and useful to his fellow Citizens nor do I believe that there is any man who possessed a higher sense of Patriotism or more devotion to the Constitution of his Country....

Esarey, Logan, *Messages and Letters of William Henry Harrison*, Vol. I, Indiana Historical Commission, Indianapolis, 1922, p. 205.

This letter, which was written to the Mississippi Governor after Floyd was indicted there for treason, was intended to convince its recipient of Floyd's moral fiber and his lack of knowledge of Burr's intentions, whatever they may have been. The rest of this letter appears in the Chapter 6. At least at this moment Gov. Harrison held Floyd in high regard.

First Session of Second General Assembly Held in 1807/Law concerning Servants/1807 Legislative Memorial Favoring Slavery

This Session was a busy one for the pro-slavery men. On September 17th, 1807, a law concerning servants was allegedly adopted by the House of Representatives and the Legislative Council and approved by Gov. Harrison. Jesse B. Thomas and Benjamin Chambers both from Dearborn County signed for the House and Council respectively. This law was similar to the law concerning servants adopted and published by the Governor and the two Judges in 1803. The only difference was the addition of the following four sections:

13. If any slave or servant shall be found at the distance of ten miles from the tenement of his or her master, or the person with whom he or she lives, without a pass or some letter or token whereby it appears that he or she is proceeding by authority from his or her master, employer or overseer, it shall and may be lawful for any person to apprehend and carry him or her before a Justice of the Peace, to be by his order punished with stripes, not exceeding thirty five at his discretion.

14. If any slave or servant shall presume to come and upon the plantation or at the dwelling house of any person whatsoever, without leave from his or her owner, not being sent upon lawful business it shall be lawful for the owner of such plantation or dwelling house to

give, or order such slaves or servant ten lashes on his or her bare back.

15. Riots, routs, unlawful assemblies, trespass and seditious speeches, by any slaves, servant or servants, shall be punished with stripes, at the discretion of a Justice of Peace, not exceeding thirty-nine, and he who may apprehend and carry him, her or them before such Justice.

16. If any person shall harbor any servant or slave of color, who is bound to service, without the consent of his or her master first obtained, he or she so offending, shall be fined in any sum not exceeding one hundred dollars, at the discretion of the court, to be recovered by indictment or information; and if any person shall aid and assist any servant, or slave to abscond from his or her master, upon conviction thereof, he or she so offending, shall be fined in any sum not exceeding five hundred dollars, at the discretion of the court, for the use of the party aggrieved, to be recovered as aforesaid.

Philbrick, The Laws of Indiana Territory 1801-1809, pp. 466-467.

These additional provisions allowing the whipping of servants traveling without passes, being on others plantations, and participating in riots, turned the law concerning servants into a vicious tool for anyone wanting revenge against a servant. Being a servant in the Indiana Territory was just as bad as being a slave in the South.

Shenanigans were in high gear for on the same day the same three men signed off on another law concerning the introduction of Negroes and Mullattoes into the Territory. This law was identical to the same law on the same subject signed by the same men in 1805. Then two days later a petition or memorial to Congress dated September 19th, 1807 from the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives in the Indiana Territory stated:

Memorial to Congress, September 19, 1807

In the Legislative Council and House of Representatives in the Indiana Territory:

Great solicitude has been evinced by the citizens of this Territory on the subject of the introduction of slaves. In the year 1802 a special convention of delegates from the respective counties petitioned Congress for a suspension of the sixth article of compact, contained in the ordinance of 1787. In 1805 a majority of the members of the Legislative Council and House of Representatives remonstrated with Congress on the subject. In 1806 the Legislative Council and House of Representatives passed sundry resolutions, which were laid before Congress, declaratory of their sense of the propriety of admitting slaves; and, as the citizens of the Territory decidedly approve of the toleration of slavery, the Legislative Council and House of Representatives consider it incumbent on them to briefly state, on behalf of themselves and their constituents, the reason which have influenced them in favor of the measure.

In the first place, candor induces us to premise that, in regard to the right to holding slaves, a variety of opinion exists; whilst some consider it decent and just to acquire them either by purchase or conquest, others consider their possession, by either tenure, as a crime of the deepest stain; that it is repugnant to every principle of natural justice, of political rights, to every sentiment of humanity. Without entering into the merits of this controversy, it need only be remarked, that the proposition to introduce slavery into the Territory is not embraced by them. It is not a question of liberty or slavery. Slavery now exists in the United States, and in this Territory. It was a crime in England and their misfortune; and it now becomes a question, merely of policy in what way the slaves are to be disposed of, that they may be least dangerous to the community, most useful to their proprietors, and by which their situation may be ameliorated.

It is believed (and has not experience verified in fact?) that such is the number of slaves in the Southern States, that the safety of individuals, as well as the political institutions of those States, are exposed to no small hazard. However desirable it may be to emancipate them, it can never be done until they are dispersed; it would be equally impolitic for the whites as for the slaves. The great current of emigration is constantly flowing from the Eastern and Southern States to the Western States and Territories. The increase of population in the Western country for the last twenty years may afford some idea of its probable amount in the course of the present century; it must be immense; and were all the territories opened to the introduction of slaves, a large proportion of them would naturally be drawn from the Southern States.

From a reference to the States of Kentucky and Tennessee at the time of the last United States census, it is not believed that the number of

slaves would ever become so great as to endanger either the internal peace or future prosperity of the Territory. It is also rendered improbable from the interior situation of the Territory, its climates and productions.

Slavery is tolerated in the Territories of Orleans, Mississippi, and Louisiana; why should this Territory be excepted.

It is believed that slaves, possessed in small numbers of farmers, are better fed and better clothed than when they are crowded together in quarters by hundreds; their situation in Kentucky, Tennessee, and the back parts of Maryland and Virginia verify this belief.

Resolved, By the Legislative Council and House of Representatives of the Indiana Territory, That it is expedient to suspend for a given number of years the sixth article of compact, contained in the ordinance for the government of the Northwestern Territory, passed the 13th day of July, in the year 1787.

Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing be forwarded to the Vice President of the United States, with a request that he will lay the same before the Senate; and that a copy be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with a request that he will lay the same before the said House of Representatives; and that the Governor of this Territory be requested to forward the same, as aforesaid.

Jesse B. Thomas
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Samuel Gwathmey
President pro tem. of the Legislative Council

Passed the Legislative Council, September 19, 1807
Attest: H. Hurst, Chief Clerk

Journals of the General Assembly of Indiana Territory 1805-1815, pp. 154-156.

This petition would be attacked later in the year by the Clark County Antislavery Committee with the following statement:

In the present year of 1807, the subject was again taken up by the Legislature of this Territory, and a majority of both Houses passed certain resolutions (in the proportion of two to one) for the purpose of suspending the sixth article of compact contained in the ordinance, which we presume are before you honorable body. But let it be

understood that in the Legislative Council there were only three members present, who, for certain reasons, positively refused to sign the said resolutions; and they were reduced to the last subterfuge of prevailing on the president to leave his seat, and one of the other members to take it as president *pro tem.*, for the purpose of signing the said resolutions.

Dunn, "Slavery Petitions and Papers, *Indiana Historical Society Publications*, Vol. 2, p. 519.

The petition was signed by Thomas as Speaker of the House of Representatives and Gwathmey, President pro tem. of the Legislative Council. Gwathmey from Clark County was a proslavery man. It passed the Council on September 19th, 1807 being attested to by its Chief Clerk, Henry Hurst. The record is silent on whether it passed the House of Representatives. However, the petition was delivered to the U. S. Congress as ordered.

Gwathmey, Clark County's representative to the Legislative Council, signed the petition on behalf of the Legislative Council. How did his counterparts from Clark County stand on this issue? John Beggs had replaced Davis Floyd as Clark County's member in the House of Representatives when Floyd became Clerk of the House. What two men would be a better position to know what tomfoolery had gone on in the General Assembly up to that point? On October 10th, 1807, a huge blast came from the citizenry of Clark County headed by Beggs and Floyd.

Trends in the First Part of the Second Grade of Government (1805-1807)

The 1807 Act concerning Servants was a repeat of the 1803 law adopted by Gov. Harrison and the two judges. Arguably from a legal standpoint, the 1803 law lapsed when the Territory entered into the second stage of government. Section 5 of the Northwest Ordinance provided that laws enacted by the governor and the judges "shall be in force in the district until the organization of the General Assembly therein...." However, there was another provision (Section 11) in the Northwest Ordinance that provided in part "the governor,

legislative council, and house of representatives, shall have authority to make laws in all cases, for the good government of the district, not repugnant to the principles and articles in this ordinance established and declared" (emphasis added). Article 6 of the Ordinance definitely prohibited slavery and involuntary servitude in the Territory. But did it allow voluntary servitude? The 1805 law, an Act concerning the introduction of Negroes and Mulattoes into this Territory, was a new law that attempted to create a mechanism whereby slave owners could legitimize their slaves fifteen years and older in the Indiana Territory by converting them from involuntary servants to voluntary. This was accomplished through a process that included the slave owner bringing his slave before a court clerk, and the owner and slave agreeing before the clerk to a term of years of so-called voluntary servitude, and the clerk making a record of the same. If the slave refused to agree the owner could remove the slave from the Territory and take him or her to a territory or state where slavery was permitted. A different situation was in effect for slaves who were under the age fifteen years when they were brought into the Territory. They were automatically considered slaves in the Territory until the age of thirty-five if they were males and the age of thirty-two if they were females. And a still different situation was in effect for children of slaves born in the Territory. They were automatically considered slaves until males reached the age of thirty years and females the age of twenty-eight years. As pointed out earlier it is doubtful that the 1805 law was actually passed by the General Assembly. That may be the reason that it was passed again in 1807. All three categories (voluntary servants, children of such servants under the age of 15 years when brought to the Territory, and children of such servants born in the Territory) probably violated the prohibition against slavery and involuntary servitude in the Northwest Ordinance. Most slaves had no records of their births and it would have been difficult for them to prove when they turned the respective ages of supposed freedom.

The other 1807 law passed by the General Assembly mimicked the 1803 law adopted by Gov. Harrison and the two judges and was probably enacted to cure the possibility that it expired when the General Assembly was created. However, the 1807 law concerning servants included some new provisions. These new provisions provided for (1) up to thirty-five stripes (a stripe is a stroke of a whip) if a slave was found ten miles from his master's home without written authorization, (2) ten lashes (a lash is also a stroke of a whip) on the bare back if a slave was found on another plantation or dwelling house, and (3) up to thirty-nine stripes for rioting, unlawful assemblies, trespass, and seditious speeches. Any person who harbored a slave without the consent of the owner could be fined a sum not to exceed \$100.00 and any person who aided in the escape of a slave could be fined a sum not to exceed \$500.00. Stripes and lashes could be administered by whips, rods, or switches, the result of which could cut deep into the skin or all the way to the bone or vital organ. The 1807 law allowed any justice of peace to sanction such punishment for almost any made-up reason.

The pro-slavery men, including Gov. Harrison, Congressional Delegate Benjamin Parke, Speaker Jesse B. Thomas, and Council President Benjamin Chambers, had reached too far this time by inappropriate means. They were guilty in falsifying the actions of the two houses of government in the Territory and they were guilty of betraying basic principles of human dignity and liberty that were popular in the Indiana Territory.

Whether the Indiana Territory would become a slave territory was a major issue in the General Assembly during the years 1805-1807. What would happen next?

Books and references relied upon other than those cited in this chapter:

None.

Images:

- (1) Vintage Postcard of First Capitol of Indiana Territory and District of Louisiana at Vincennes, Indiana.
- (2) Vintage Postcard of First Capitol of Indiana Territory (Indiana State Memorial) at Vincennes, Indiana.
- (3) Vintage Postcard of Original Site of Home of "Alice of Old Vincennes" (Two Rooms of This House Built Early 1800, Located at First and Du Bois Streets) in Vincennes, Indiana.
- (4) Vintage Postcard of Grouseland (the White House of the West and the House in Which Gen. Harrison Lived, While Governor of Indiana Territory) in Vincennes, Indiana .
- (5) Vintage Postcard of the Beautiful Wabash River at Vincennes.
- (6) Vintage Postcard of Early House at Vincennes.