

(Lords Haldane, Parker, Sumner, Strathclyde and Parmoor) came to the conclusion that as the land shortly below the plaintiff's ferry on both sides of the river served by the plaintiff's ferry had been acquired for public purposes and the lands on the north side had been laid out as a public park in consequence of which the public resorted to it in large numbers, and for their convenience the park authority had licensed the defendant to moor a barge in the river adjoining the park to carry persons visiting the park across the river to the opposite side. This must be regarded as a "new and different traffic" from that for which the plaintiff's franchise had been granted, and was therefore not an interference with the plaintiff's ferry. But their Lordships agreed with the Court of Appeal that as the plaintiff had failed to establish any interference entitling him to relief, it would be improper to make any declaration as to his right to the franchise claimed by him.

PRIZE COURT—ENEMY CARGO ON BRITISH SHIP—DIVERSION TO
BRITISH PORT—CARGO DISCHARGED INTO OIL TANKS—
LIABILITY TO SEIZURE.

The Roumanian (1916) A.C. 124. A British ship, having on board at the outbreak of hostilities an enemy cargo, was diverted by the owners into a British port, and under their orders part of the cargo was discharged into oil tanks on shore. After the greater part of the cargo had been so discharged, the whole cargo was seized and condemned as lawful prize as droits of Admiralty. On behalf of the owners of the cargo it was contended that the cargo, being on a British ship before the outbreak of hostilities, was immune from seizure; and that even if liable to seizure while on board the ship, it ceased to be so when transferred to the oil tanks, which it was claimed were not within the port where the vessel was, and therefore beyond the jurisdiction of the Admiralty. But the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Mersey, Parker, Sumner, and Parmoor and Sir Edward Barton) negatived all these contentions, and held that the jurisdiction of the Prize Court extended to the oil in the tanks and did not depend on the locality where the oil was seized but on the fact that it was taken as a prize, and that it was immaterial whether the tanks were within the port of discharge or not.

PRIZE COURT—PLEDGES OF ENEMY CARGO—CONSIGNEES UNDER
BILL OF LADING—OWNERSHIP—BOUNTY OF CROWN.

The Odessa (1915) A.C. 145. This was another appeal from the Admiralty Prize Court. The prize in question was an enemy