# ACT OF STATE IN ENGLISH LAW

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649086955

Act of state in English law by W. Harrison Moore

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd. Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

# W. HARRISON MOORE

# ACT OF STATE IN ENGLISH LAW

Trieste



# ACT OF STATE IN ENGLISH LAW

# BY W. HARRISON MOORE

OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER AT LAW; FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF EING'S COLLEGE, CAMERIDGE; DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF LAW IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MELFOURNE; AUTHOR OF THE "CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA"



### LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

1906

#### A

				1 405
A. G. v. Hallett (1846), 15 M. & W. 97 .	1	×.	÷.	46
Weeden & Shales (1699), Parker, 267	10	00		138
Anon (1682), 1 Vern. 120		s		28
Austria, Emperor of, v. Day & Kossuth (1861)	, 3 I	)e G. F.	& J.	
217	4		28,	112, 148

#### в

Bankers' Case		8	Q	an an Alana an Alana Alana an Alana an Ala	24
Barclay v. Russell (1797), 3 Ves. 423	1.0	. 153,	157,	160, 162	, 170
Barnett, In ro (1902), 1 Ch. 847 .	- 42	14	ie S		100
Bates's Case (1606), 2 St. Tr. 371	10 r			. 9, 1	2, 49
Bellamont's Case, 2 Salk, 625		. (i)	1		46
Berne, City of, v. Bank of England (1	804), 9	Vea. 342	<b>7</b>	. 37	, 162
Blackburn v. Thompson (1812), 15 Es			95	*	37
Blad's, Peter, Case (1673), 3 Swanston	1, 603				25
Bode's, Baron de, Case (1851), 3 H. L.	C. 449	1. A	8	1	132
Brown v. U. S. (1814), 8 Cranch, 110	1.00	3 <b>4</b>	×	81	138
Brunswick, Duke of, v. King of Har	iover (	1844), 6	Beav	. 1;	
(1848), 1 H. L. 1	1			, 40, 117	, 121
Buron v. Denman (1848), 2 Ex. 167	133	4	1. and	1. C.	6, 94

#### C

Cameron v. Kyte (1835), 3 Knapp, 341 .			20	81
Campbell v. Hall (1774), Cowper, 204 .	1	Sam		80, 174
회원 방법은 물건을 수 있었는 것 같아요. 집에는 것이지 않는 것이 있는 것이 같아요. 것이 같아요. 것이 있는 것이 가지 않는 것이 것이 같아요.	2	37,	120, 1	22, 123
Castioni, In re (1891), 1 Q. B. 149 .	2		. 1	15, 116
Cawdry's Case	*		**	13
Cawthorne v. Campbell, 1 Anst. 205 .	2	1	33	46
	<b>3</b>	4	10	11
Charkieh (1873), L. R., 4 A. & E. 59 .	×	363	80	33
Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia, 5 Petera,	1			109

Chinese Exclusion Case, 130 U. S. 581	È.		1.42	43, 8	PAGE 3, 134
Christian County Court v. Rankin, 87		ican	Decision,	- 10.000 Million	117
Churton v. Wilkin, W. N. (94), 62	(+)	*:			46
Commendum, Case of		- P			7
Cook v. Sprigg (1899), A. C. 572	*	¥0	. 78	, 82, 13	2, 175
Cooper, In re (1891), 143 U. S. 472			36, 80	, 83, 10	1, 134
Coorg, Rajah of, r. East India Co. (18	00), 29	Beav	. 300	, 10	6, 116

#### D

Darnel's Case, 3 St. Tr. 36	¥		. ¥1	÷.	10, 13
Dawkins v. Lord F. Paulet (1869), L.	R. 5, Q	. B. 94	1.	100	98
v. Lord Rokeby, L. R. 7, H. L. 7	44		222		98
Debs, In re (1894), 158 U. S. 564	24				30
De Haber v. Queen of Portugal (1851)	, 17 Q.	B. 196	i .		43
Diego, Don, v. Bingley, Hob. 78	् <u>र</u> ् २	æ	43		153
Direct United States Cable Co. v. An	glo-An	erican	Teleg	raph	
Co. (1877), 2 App. Cas. 394.				1	35
Dobree v. Napier (2 Bing, N. C. 781)	2	191	43	1.	122-125
Doe d. Legh v. Roe (1841), 8 M. & W.	579				46
Dolder v. Huntingfield (1805), 11 Ves	. 283	ne Seetaan a		38,	158, 161
Doss v. Secretary of State for Indi		5), L.	R. 19	Eq.	pecervices.
509		. 8	0, 107,	171,	172, 178
Dutton v. Howell (1694), Shower's "I	Parliam				67

#### E

E. I. Co. v. Syed Ally (1827), 7 Moo. Ind. Ap	p. 55	5.		106
Elphinstone v. Bedreechund (1830), 2 St. Tr.,	N. 8	5. 379	62, 7	5, 105
Entick v. Carrington (1765), 19 St. Tr. 1030	1.000	enasong Fi		22
Esposito v. Bowden (1857), 7 E. & B. 781	÷.		- 62	39

#### F

Felkin v. Lord Herbert (1861), I Dr.	& Sm	608			45, 129
Ford v. Surget (1875), 97 U. S. 594	3013	÷.		40	117
Forrester v. Secretary of State (1872)	), L. R	, Ind.	App. 3	Supp.	
Vol. p. 10					106
Foster v. Globe Venture Syndicate (1	900),	1 Ch. 8	311 .		33
v. Neilson (2 Peters, 253) .	29	2.5	~		36
Franconia, The (1876), 2 Ex. Div. 1	8	- ie .			34

# G

Georgia, State of, v. Stanton (1867), 6 Wall, 50			109
Gibson v. East India Co. (1839), 5 Bing, N. C. 273	22	ų.	103, 104
Gladstone v Ottoman Bank (1863), 1 H. & M. 505	35	4	139
Godden v. Hales (1686), Shower, 475	19	с×.	21
Grant v. Secretary of State for India in Council	(1877),	3	
C. P. D. 445	-14-00-082 - 14		101, 107

# н

Hampden's Case, 3 St. Tr. 825	eo			23, 61
Hart v. Gampach (1872), L. R. 4 P. C. 439		4	<u>.</u>	121
Hawley v. Steele (1877), 6 Ch. D., 528	1			62
Hill v. Bigge, 3 Moo. P. C. 465	<b>e</b> : :::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::		69,	72, 73
Holyoake Water Power Co. v. Connecticut	River	Co.,	22	
Blatchford, 131		6)	12	113
Hullett v. King of Spain (1828), 2 Bligh, N. S.	. 31			146

# I

India, Secretary for S	State in Co	suncil	, v. Kam	achee I	loye S	lahaba		
(1859), 13 Moo.	P. C. 22	14		•		2, 41,	100,	106

# J

Jacobs v. Crédit Lyonnais (1884), 12 Q. B. D., 589 .	((#	140
Janson v. Driefontein Gold Mines (1900), 2 K. B. 339	Die .	38
Jones v. U. S. (1890), 137 U. S. 202		36

# K

Kansas, State of, r. State of Colorado (1901),	185 L	J. S. 125	10	11, 113
Kentucky v. Dennison (24 Howard, 66)		43	29	109
King, The, v. Louw (1904), A. C. 412 .		1	1	117
v. Williamson (1672), Freeman, 39		220	2	138

# L

Little v. Barreme, 2 Cranch, 177	10	<b>1</b>		102
London, Mayor, etc., of, v. Bennet, 6 Car, 1			÷.	25
Louisiana v. Jumel (1882), 107 U. S. 711	¥3	63	36	46
Luby v. Lord Wodehouse (1865), 17 Ir. C. L.	Reports	618		71
Luther v. Borden (1849), 7 Howard, 1 .		•		51

#### м

Machado v. Fontes (1897), 2 Q. B. 231					122
Manilla, The (1805), 1 Edwards Adm.	Deres	4. 1	1.0	10	37
1.4.2.4 전에 1.1.1.4 ·······························	webea	15, 1	mar in source	and the	TRACE AND ADDRESS
Marais, Ex parte (1902), A. C. 109	•		39, 43,	54, 58,	59, 63
Mennicr, In rc (1894), 2 Q. B. 415	+0-0		1.4	:+:	116
Mighell v. Sultan of Jahore (1894), 1 Q	. B. 1	49	1		34, 37
Milligan, Ex parte (1866), 4 Wallace, 1		33	24	43, 54,	58, 62
Missouri v. Illinois and the Sanitary Di		of CI	nicago (19	900),	
180 U. S. 208	÷		.÷	- 1	10, 113
Mitchell v. Harmony (1851), 13 Howard	rd, 11.	5.	- 18 - II	34	51, 53
Moreom v. P. M. G., Journal of Comp.	Leg.	Dec.	1900, 514	É se i	61
Mostyn v. Fabrigas (1774), Cowper, 16				-	69, 72
Mouse's Case, 12 Rep. 62	¥	22		<u>,</u>	48
Musgrove v. Pulido (1879), 5 App. Cas.	102		33	4	73
v. Toy (1891), A. C. 272	¥0				95, 99

#### Ν

Nabob of the Carnatie v. East India	Co. (	1791),	1 Ves.	Jr.	
371		- A - 2	40, 41,	105, 106	, 153
Napier, Ex parte, 21 L. J. Q. B. 332	. K	S			104
Nireaha Tamaki v. Baker (1894), N. Z	. 12 L.	R. 48:	3.	+	134
Non obstante, Case of, 12 Rep. 18	63	•	38		21

#### 0

Ogden v. Folliott (1789), 1 H. Bl. 123 ; (1790), 3 T. R. 726 141, 145

#### P

Parlement Belge, The (1880), 4 P. D. 129; 5 P. D. 1	97	38, 8	87, 137
Pelican, The, I Edwards Adm. Rep. Appendix D		** <sup>2</sup>	37
Penn v. Baltimore	-		108
People, The, v. M <sup>4</sup> Leed (1841), N. Y. Hill, 377		43, 15	26, 129
Peru, Republic of, v. Dreyfus (1888), 38 Ch. D. 348		37, 16	32, 168
v. Peruvian Guano Co. (1887), 36 Ch. Div. 489	$\sim$	1	168
Phillips v. Eyre (1869), L. R. 4 Q. B. 225 ; 6 Q. B. 1		+:-	69, 72
Poll v. Lord Advocate (1899), 1 Fraser, 823 .	÷.	100	94
Prohibitions, Case of, 12 Rep. 64	33		11

Quinn v. Leatham (1901), A. C. 495

98

					FAGE
R. v. Brailsford (1905), 2 K. B. 730		.*2	¥/2	< e	156
v. Carew, 3 Swanston, 670.		in anno			27
v. Commissioner of Customs (1	836), 3	5 A. & E.	380	1	46
v. de Berenger (1814), 3 M. &	S. 67	323	¥3	- 24	38
v. Keyn, 2 Ex. D. 1 .			+11		125
v. Lesley (1860), 29 L. J. M. C.	. 97	8		. 1	24, 125
v. Lords Commissioners of th	ie Tre	asury (1)	872), I	, R.	
7 Q. B. 387		1999	22	÷ 4	45
Rhode Island v. Massachusetts, 12 I	eters,	657 .	•::		108
Ruck v. Williams (1858), 27 L. J. E	x, 357		. ÷	5.0	105
Rundle v. Delaware and Raritan Co	uncil,	1 Wallac	e, Jr. 5	275 .	113
Rustomjec v. The Queen (1876), L.	R., 1 G	. B. 487	2 Q. 1	B. 69	
		9.900 State Sta	111000100000		33, 136

#### s

Salig Ram, Rajah v. Secretary of	f State	(1872),	L. R.	Ind,	
App. Supp. Vol. 119 .		and the second sec	22479-0023 13		106
Saltpetre, Case of, 12 Rep. 12 .	12	(4)	¥3	(6)	48
Ship-money, Case of, 3 St. Tr. 904			• • •	1.42	48
Sicilies, King of the Two, v. P. &	O. Co. a	nd Wil	lcox (18	350),	
19 L. J. N. S. 202		neer nee			162
Sirdar Bhagwan Singh v. Secreta	ry of S	tate (1	874), L	. R.	
2 Ind. App. Cas. 38					106
Southampton and Itchin Bridge	Co. v. S	outham	pton I	local	
Board (1858), 8 E. & B. 811	33	82	20 - EE	3.65	105
Sparhawk v. The Republic, 1 Dalla	18, 357	- C	×S	(in)	51
Sprigg r. Sigeau (1897), A. C. 238		1	-		77
Stanley v. Wild (1900), 1 Q. B. 256	4	22	- 23		46
Stock v. Denew (1697), 1 Ca. Ch. 3	05 .	10	<b>3</b> 0	24,	85, 137
Sullivan v. Earl Spencer (1872), 6 I	ir. R. Co	m. Law	, 173		71, 72
Sutton v. Johnstone (1786), 1 T. R.	493	1		- S.	64, 98

#### $\mathbf{T}$

Tandy v. Lord Westmoreland (1792), 2	7 St.	Tr. 1246	6.	. 70	), 72
Taylor v. Barclay (1828), 2 Simons, 213	6	4			33
v. Morton, 2 Curtis, 454 .	÷	- X	¥2		135
Teira Te Poca v. Roera Tareha (1896),	N.Z	. 15 L. F	2. 91	8 397	134
Thayer v. Brooks, 17 Ohio, 489 .	+		•		113
Tivnan, In re (1864), 5 B. & S. 645		÷.	- 43,		116
Troner v. Hassold (1678), 1 Ca. Ch. 173		(#)	- 42	24, 85, 86,	137