

Bench Division, and before whom the person suspected may appear, to assist the Secretary of State in arriving at a conclusion.

Before leaving this subject there is one other matter to which we must refer. Five Judges of the King's Bench, three Lords Justices, and the Lord Chancellor, Lord Dunedin, Lord Atkinson, and Lord Wrenbury have held the regulation *intra vires*. The sole dissenting Judge was Lord Shaw, and his judgment, which can only be characterised as an extraordinary tirade on the subject of what he calls British liberty, one can hardly believe was delivered by a member of the highest tribunal of the Empire. Two shore extracts—we quote from the *Times* report—are sufficient:—

“Under this the Government became a Committee of Public Safety. But its powers as such were far more arbitrary than those of the most famous Committee of Public Safety known to history.”

And again:—

“The analogy was with a practice, more silent, more sinister—with the *lettres de cachet* of Louis Quatorze. No trial: proscription. The victim might be ‘regulated’—not in his course of conduct or of action, not as to what he should do or avoid doing. He might be regulated to prison or to the scaffold.”

Observations, certainly neither judicial nor accurate, and to which another description might well be well applied.—*Law Times*.

REPRISALS AND THEIR LIMITS.

There has been an interesting correspondence in the columns of the *Times* on the legitimacy of the recent air-raid reprisals at Freiburg. Amongst those who have taken part in it, in addition to Sir Edward Clarke, whose first letter we printed last week, are Professor Dicey, Professor Holland, Sir Herbert Stephen, and “Jurist.” Several of these letters we print elsewhere. The general result of the correspondence is to base the opposition to such reprisals on grounds of morality and honour, and not upon any prohibition recognized by international law. In other words, they are immoral and dishonourable, though