

The object of the petitioner is to obtain now the indemnification to which he would have been entitled under the aforesaid act, on his compliance with the requirements of the same. The committee having satisfied themselves, from an examination of the evidence produced to them, of the existence and loss of the original certificates described in the petition, and that the petitioner would have been entitled to indemnification therefor under the act of 1814, if he had presented his claim to the commissioners appointed to carry the said act into effect, and had in other respects complied with the provisions of the same; and that Congress have already, by an act passed on April 16, 1818, in behalf of the representatives of George Pearson, extended relief in a similar case; and having, moreover, ascertained by inquiry at the proper department, that a considerable balance of the sums appropriated by the aforesaid act for the indemnification of the holders of claims denominated citizens' rights, and also of the holders of claims in the Tennessee Company, remain unexpended in the treasury of the United States, have considered that the prayer of the petitioner is reasonable, and that it ought to be granted.

By referring to the secretary of the board of commissioners under the act of 1814, the committee have ascertained that the indemnification which was allowed to the holders of citizens' rights in the purchase of the western territory of the State of Georgia was at the rate of twelve and a half cents per acre. The number of acres called for by the scrip held by the petitioner being 71,711 acres, the amount to which he is entitled is \$8,963 87½ cents, for which sum they accordingly report a bill.

20TH CONGRESS.]

No. 733.

[2D SESSION.]

APPLICATION OF INDIANA CLAIMING ALL THE PUBLIC LANDS IN THAT STATE.

COMMUNICATED TO THE SENATE FEBRUARY 10, 1829.

Resolved by the general assembly of the State of Indiana, That this State, being a sovereign, free, and independent State, has the exclusive right to the soil and eminent domain of all the unappropriated lands within her acknowledged boundaries, which right was reserved for her by the State of Virginia, in the deed of cession of the Northwestern Territory to the United States, being confirmed and established by the articles of confederacy and the Constitution of the United States.

That our senators in Congress be instructed, and our representatives requested, to use every exertion in their power, by reason and argument, to induce the United States to acknowledge this vested right of the States, and place her upon an equal footing with the original States, in every respect whatsoever, as well in fact as in name.

That his excellency the governor be requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of our senators and representatives in Congress, and to each of their excellencies the governors of each of the following States, to wit: Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama, requesting them to lay it before the legislatures of their respective States for consideration, requesting them to adopt similar measures if they should deem it expedient.

ISAAC HOWK, *Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
M. STAPP, *President of the Senate.*

Approved January 9, A. D. 1829.

J. BROWN RAY.

20TH CONGRESS.]

No. 734.

[2D SESSION.]

CORRECTION OF ERROR IN PATENT FOR BOUNTY LAND.

COMMUNICATED TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FEBRUARY 12, 1829.

Mr. ISACKS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill from the Senate, entitled "An act for the relief of Alexander Cunningham," reported:

That though it appears by the letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, of the 9th of January last, that an error was committed in making out the grant for the military bounty of said Cunningham's father, whereby a quarter section of land was inserted that had previously been granted, yet it is also shown, and so understood, that this error might now be corrected in the office, and a new patent be issued for the quarter section for which the warrant issued; and the committee do not consider that another quarter section ought to be selected or drawn for, especially as it appears from the evidence before them that the person to be benefited by the relief is not the grantee, or his heir-at-law, but an assignee of the title. They therefore recommend the rejection of the bill.