sed to

fferent nat deby the are raparties. ty, and

f their ul and hority, aptors. erty in eet the ions of to him

tion of

for the

ested-

lospital

the obt a faillajefty's d by the ubscondnplies a be conthis har-

nothing

unter v.

Potts, which were cited at the Bar, Provincial Laws were held not to have a complete operation for the benefit of persons who went into a Colony merely to take advantage of those Laws, how then shall such a temporary and involuntary visit give them effect to any person's detriment?

2. I have hitherto confined my observations to the words of the Province Act itself, and have shewn that it does not apply to Prize-Money, because it is not the property there described, and because neither the Prize-Agent, or the Sailor himself, are the persons against whom it is directed.

I proceed now to another point, that such cannot be the true interpretation of the Province Act, because, if it were, the Act itself would be repugnant to the Prize Acts, since enacted, and there-

fore so far illegal and void.

It is an admitted principle of Law, and was stated as fuch by Lord Mansfield,\* that the Colonies take all the Common and Statute Law of England, which is applicable to their state and condition. The Regulations in the Prize Act extend expressly to the Colonies, and fince all the right which Captors have in Prize is created by them, in conjunction with the Proclamation, these title deeds must be taken with all their limitations. Either the whole is applicable, or no part. It cannot be faid we will take the Proclamation and the Statutes as they give prize to the Captors, but we will reject the conditions under which it is given. and 8 Wm. III. C. 22, Sect. 9, "All Laws, in any of the Plantations, which are repugnant to any Laws to be made in Great-Britain, so far as such

<sup>\*</sup> Lindo v. Rodney -- Douglas