

to be released from detention. Bailhache and Low, JJ., who heard the application, held that the Court had in such circumstances no jurisdiction to interfere with the exercise of the Royal prerogative and refused the motion. The applicant was held to be an alien enemy and as such being resident in the United Kingdom if in the opinion of the Executive Government a person hostile to the welfare of the country he was properly subject to be interned, and might properly be described as a prisoner of war, although neither a combatant, nor a spy. The Court, in arriving at this conclusion, followed a judgment of the Court of Appeal in *Ex parte Weber*, which is reported in a note on p. 280.

ALIEN ENEMY—INTERNEED NON-NATURALIZED GERMAN—CONTRACT
ENTERED INTO AFTER DECLARATION OF WAR—RIGHT TO
ENFORCE CONTRACT MADE AFTER DECLARATION OF WAR BY
ALIEN ENEMY.

Schaffenius v. Goldberg (1916) 1 K.B. 284. The plaintiff in this case was a non-naturalized German subject resident in England, and he sought to enforce a contract entered into by him with the defendant after the declaration of war with Germany. After the commencement of the action he had been interned as an alien enemy after registration. The case was thereupon brought on for argument as to whether in such circumstances the plaintiff was entitled to maintain the action. Younger, J., held that the internment of the plaintiff did not operate as revocation of the licence to remain in the United Kingdom which is implied in registration; and that the contract sued on, not being prohibited by any proclamation against trading with the enemy, the plaintiff might maintain the action notwithstanding his internment, and with this conclusion the Court of Appeal (Hon. Cozens-Hardy, M.R., and Bankes and Warrington, L.JJ.) agreed.

CRIMINAL LAW—TRIAL—FOREIGNER—IGNORANCE OF ENGLISH,
TRANSLATION OF EVIDENCE—WAIVER BY COUNSEL—PRACTICE.

The King v. Lee Kun (1916) 1 K.B. 337. This was an application by the prisoner who had been convicted of murder to quash the conviction on the ground that the evidence given against him at the trial had not been translated, he being a Chinese, and not understanding the English language in which the evidence was given. The prisoner had been represented by Counsel at the trial, who made no demand to have the evidence translated. The evidence given at the trial did not differ from that