Parliament towards religion is that of Pilate, who scoffingly asked, "What is Truth?" in the spirit of one who thinks that there is no such thing. It is to be hoped not; but, at all events, this much is clear, that "public policy," according to the English Court of Appeal, is now in favour of affording the assistance of the Courts to the spread of doctrines inimical to what probably the vast majority of English-speaking people still regard to be the Truth.

In view of the recent decision of the English Court of Appeal, what, it may be asked, ought now to be the answer to the question heading this article? It can hardly be said that the Court of Appeal has denied that Christianity is still part of the law of England, but, rather, that it has decided that it no longer enjoys any right to protection from assault, but may be attacked and societies formed in opposition to it, in just the same manner as any temporal law may be attacked and a society formed for its repeal. Whether this is really sound public policy, we venture respectfully to doubt.

If we have correctly interpreted the decision of the Court of Appeal, then it may be said that Christianity is still part of the law of England, but it has no transcendent polition. It is reduced now to the level of merely temporal laws; it is the law of the land only so far as the State and the Courts of law see fit to give effect to it, and is no freer from criticism than any other part of the law.

INTERNMENT OF ALIEN ENEMIES.

The legal position of civilians in this country who, while ceasing, in fact, to be German, have not acquired British nationality has again been raised, and in *Re Lichmann*, Times, 7th inst., an important judgment has been pronounced by a Divisional Court consisting of Bailhache and Low, JJ.

Liebmann was born at Mannhein in 1868, being by descent a subject of Germany. In 1889 he came to England on business, in 1890 obtained a formal discharge from German nationality, but did not take out letters of naturalization in England, and