

for the time being belonging thereto, in the same manner as if the vessel or persons were within the limits of the original jurisdiction of the Court, justice or magistrate."

"712. This part of this Act shall, except where otherwise provided, apply to the whole of Her Majesty's Dominions." And section 13 of the Admiralty Act, 1891, supplements these sections of the Imperial Statute: "Any suit may be instituted in any district registry, when the ship or property, the subject of the suit, is, at the time of the institution of the suit, within the district of such registry."

The decision of the Supreme Court seems also to conflict with the ratio decidendi of cases in which international rights have been violated. In the case *Richmond v. United States*, 9 Cranch U.S. 102, Chief Justice Marshall, of the Supreme Court of the United States, held that although the seizure of an American vessel within the territorial waters of a friendly nation was an international offence against that nation, the civil Court had no jurisdiction to take cognizance of it. The jurisdiction affecting the mode of seizure belonged to the political, not the judicial, department of the government; and the civil Court could not connect an international trespass with the subsequent seizure and trial of the vessel by the civil Court having ordinary jurisdiction in the case, so as to annul the proceedings against such vessel; that being "found" within the territorial jurisdiction of the civil Court, it was competent to try the case.

A similar doctrine governs the powers of criminal Courts. Thus where an alleged criminal has been kidnapped in Peru and brought to the United States, the Court held that having been "found within the jurisdiction of a Court competent to try him," his mode of arrest could not be considered by the Court, or used as evidence to oust its jurisdiction to try him for the offence charged: *Ex parte Ker*, 18 Fed. R. 167. So where an alleged criminal had been captured in Hamburg, and brought to England against his will, it was held by the Central Criminal Court that being "found within the jurisdiction of a competent Court," that Court had jurisdiction to try him for the alleged offence: *Reg. v. Sattler*, 27 L.J.M.C. 50.