Statute I.
April 2, 1802.

[Obsolete.]
Appropriation.

Chap. XV.—*An Act making a partial appropriation for the support of government, during the year one thousand eight hundred and two.*

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the sum of one hundred thousand dollars, to be paid out of any monies in the treasury, not otherwise appropriated, shall be, and the same hereby is appropriated towards defraying the expenditure of the civil list, including the contingent expenses of the several departments, during the year one thousand eight hundred and two.

Approved, April 2, 1802.

---

either case their rights became extinct, the lands could be granted disencumbered of the right of occupancy, or enjoyed in full dominion by the purchasers from the Indians. Such was the tenure of Indian lands by the laws of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. *Ibid.*

Grants made by the Indians at public councils, since the treaty at Fort Stanwick's, have been made directly to the purchasers, or to the state in which the land lies, in trust for them, or with directions to convey to them; of which there are many instances of large tracts so sold and held; especially in New York. *Ibid.*

It was an universal rule, that purchases made at Indian treaties, in the presence, and with the approbation of the officer under whose direction they were held by the authority of the crown, gave a valid title to the lands; it prevailed under the laws of the states after the revolution, and yet continues in those where the right to the ultimate fee is owned by the states, or their grantees. It has been adopted by the United States, and purchases made at treaties held by their authority, have been always held good by the ratification of the treaty, without any patent to the purchasers from the United States. This rule in the colonies was founded on a settled rule of the law of England, that by his prerogative, the king was the universal occupant of all vacant lands in his dominions, and had the right to grant them at his pleasure, or by his authorized officers. *Ibid.*

When the United States acquired and took possession of the Floridas, the treaties which had been made with the Indian tribes, before the acquisition of the territory by Spain and Great Britain, remained in force over all the ceded territory, as the laws which regulated the relations with all the Indians who were parties to them, and were binding on the United States, by the obligation they had assumed by the Louisiana treaty, as a supreme law of the land, which was inviolable by the power of Congress. They were also binding as the fundamental law of Indian rights; acknowledged by royal orders, and municipal regulations of the province, as the laws and ordinances of Spain in the ceded provinces, which were declared to continue in force by the proclamation of the governor in taking possession of the provinces; and by the acts of Congress, which assured all the inhabitants of protection in their property. It would be an unwarranted construction of these treaties, laws, ordinances and municipal regulations, to decide that the Indians were not to be maintained in the enjoyment of all the rights which they could have enjoyed under either, had the provinces remained under the dominion of Spain. It would be rather a perversion of their spirit, meaning and terms, contrary to the injunction of the law under which the court acts, which makes the stipulations of any treaty, the laws and ordinances of Spain, and these acts of Congress, so far as either apply to this case, the standard rules for its decision. *Ibid.*

The treaties with Spain and England, before the acquisition of Florida by the United States, which guarantied to the Seminole Indians their lands according to the right of property with which they possessed them, were adopted by the United States; who thus became the protectors of all the rights they had previously enjoyed, or could of right enjoy under Great Britain or Spain, as individuals or nations, by any treaty, to which the United States thus became parties in 1803. *Ibid.*

The Indian right to the lands as property, was not merely of possession, that of alienation was concomitant; both were equally secured, protected and guarantied by Great Britain and Spain, subject only to ratification and confirmation by the license, charter or deed from the governor representing the king. Such purchases enabled the Indians to pay their debts, compensate for their depredations on the traders resident among them to provide for their wants; while they were available to the purchasers as payment of the considerations which at their expense had been received by the Indians. It would have been a violation of the faith of the government to both, to encourage traders to settle in the province, to put themselves and property in the power of the Indians, to suffer the latter to contract debts, and when willing to pay them by the only means in their power, a cession of their lands, withhold an assent to the purchase, which by their laws or municipal regulations, was necessary to vest a title. Such a course was never adopted by Great Britain, in any of her colonies, nor by Spain in Louisiana or Florida. *Ibid.*

The laws made it necessary, when the Indians sold their lands, to have the deeds presented to the governor for confirmation. The sales by the Indians transferred the kind of right which they possessed; the ratification of the sale by the governor, must be regarded as a relinquishment of the title of the crown to the purchaser; and no instance is known where permission to sell has been "refused, or the rejection of an Indian sale." *Ibid.*

The colonial charters, a great portion of the individual grants by the proprietary and royal governments, and a still greater portion by the states of the Union after the revolution, were made for lands within the Indian hunting grounds. North Carolina and Virginia to a great extent paid their officers and soldiers of the revolutionary war by such grants, and extinguished the arrears due the army by similar means. It was one of the great resources which sustained the war, not only by those states, but by other states. The ultimate fee, encumbered with the right of Indian occupancy, was in the crown previous to the revolution, and in the states of the Union afterwards, and subject to grant. This right of occupancy was protected by the political power, and respected by the courts, until extinguished, when the patentee took the unencumbered fee. So the supreme court and the state courts have uniformly held. Clark *v.* Smith, 13 Peters, 195.