

place within the jurisdiction of either of the governments, for the use of a space of canal, a part of which extends beyond its limits, such toll might be considered as forming a portion of the product of the canal property within the jurisdiction of the government where they were gathered. *Drybutter v. Bartholomew*, 2 P. Will. 127; *The King v. The Aire & Calder Navigation*, 2 T. R. 666; *The King v. Mayor of London*, 4 T. R. 21.

Hence, it appears, that directing the estate of this corporation to be deemed personal property, can amount to no more than declaring, that it shall be governed by the municipal regulations of the country where it lies in relation to personal property, instead of those relative to real estate; but that it must, nevertheless, be governed by those laws, and none other, as being an immovable portion of the habitation of the nation. These principles of public law, in regard to the immovable property of this corporation lying beyond the confines of this State, bring us back to the question, whether this Court can exercise any jurisdiction in relation to such property, and to what extent.

147 * Although the power of our government constitutionally to create a corporation beyond its jurisdiction, or to confer the rights and privileges of a body politic upon any but its own immediate citizens, so as thus to give an extra-territorial operation to its legislative enactments, may well be doubted; yet the establishment of a body politic, clothed with authority to conduct expensive and profitable operations beyond the limits of the State by which it was created; and under governments by which its corporate existence has not been recognized, it is believed, is a matter of no very extraordinary or rare occurrence. The East India Company, and The South Sea Company of England, *The Company of Merchant Adventurers v. Rebow*, 3 Mod. 126; *Jacob's Law Dict. V. Turkey Company*; and The Temascaltepec Mining Company of Baltimore, The Tlalcotal Mining Company of Baltimore, and some others here, are corporations having such powers. 1826, ch. 81; 1827, ch. 174; 1828, ch. 57 & 132; 1829, ch. 42. If an individual has a well founded claim, arising from, or is likely to suffer by the foreign operations of such a corporation, and the case be of an equitable character, this Court may take cognizance of it, and grant relief, if the body politic or its property are to be found within reach of its process. *Nabob of the Carnatic v. East India Company*, 1 Ves. Jun. 371; S. C. 2 Ves. Jun. 56. And so too a corporation which has been created by a foreign government, is a legal entity of which the Courts of this Republic will take notice, and allow to sue, and maintain its rights here; and have funds here applied to its use out of the limits of the State. *Henriques v. Dutch West India Company*, 2 Ld. Raym. 1532; *Attorney-General v. The Mayor of London*, 3 Bro. C. C. 171; S. C. 1 Ves. Jun. 244; *Barclay v. Russell*, 3 Ves. 424; *The National Bank of St. Charles v.*