than

rs of ityne,

who of a he is arms.

Rex ation,

er ]. nemy cense plied act is ident ind a f the orohi-

ading ed by ubsenain-

him dberg,

realm regis, iemy. dated

484 nberg,

1915, 1 K.B. 857 C.A; In re Mary Excep-Duchess of Sutherland, Bechoff, tions to David & Co. v. Bubna, 1915, 31 General T.L.R. 248; Volkl v. Rotunda Rule Hospital, 1914, 2 K. B. (Ir.) 543; Princess of Thurn & Taxis v. Moffitt, 1915, 1 Ch. D. 58.]

Saving these exceptions, all contracts Trading with enemies are void, and in addition contracts trading contracts with enemies are actually illegal unless licensed by the Crown, for under the law as to trading with the enemy it is illegal to aid and comfort the enemy because such aid and comfort amounts to adherence to the King's enemies. [The Hoop, 1797, 1 Ch. Rob. at p. 196-200; Esposito v. Bowden, 7 Ell. & B. 763 at p. 779.]

Contracts of this type are happily rare nowadays for the public has had ample notice of the illegality of commercial activities with the enemy and traitorous correspondence with them by the issue of the various Royal Proclamations since the outbreak of the present war.

It is the class of contract made before war with persons who subsequently became enemies that is of practical importance, and with this class a large number of the recent decisions are concerned. These are noted in the succeeding chapters under distinct headings.