

the Court in granting a rule, intimating that, on its return, steps would be taken to prevent the prisoner being charged, in the event of his extradition, with any offence except such as would properly come within the Act and treaty. As regards the second point, what was alleged on behalf of the prisoner was that according to the French law the prisoner would be liable to be interrogated by the Court as to certain alleged political secrets, and that, whatever the technical description of the offence for which he is extradited and put on his trial, his punishment will depend upon his disclosure or non-disclosure of these political secrets. But the Court was clearly of opinion that the exception in the Extradition Act in favor of persons who have committed political offences, only contemplates a political offence which has actually been committed, and for which, under cover of trying the offender for an extraditable offence, the foreign tribunal is seeking to punish him. In the present case the offences charged and for which extradition was sought were plainly non-political, and the Court could not judicially inquire into the bona fides of a friendly foreign government making a demand for extradition.

CROWN, PREROGATIVE OF—CIVIL SERVICE—TENURE OF OFFICE—DISMISSAL OF OFFICERS IN SERVICE OF THE CROWN.

In *Dunn v. The Queen*, (1896) 1 Q.B. 116, the plaintiff presented a petition of right claiming to recover damages for wrongful dismissal from the service of the Crown. The plaintiff alleged that he had been appointed a consular agent for the period of three years, and that before the expiration of that time he had been dismissed without cause. Day, J., who tried the action, held that contracts for the service of the Crown were terminable at the pleasure of the Crown, and therefore dismissed the petition. The Court of Appeal (Lord Esher, M.R., Lord Herschell and Kay, L.J.) agreed with him, holding that the doctrine that service under the Crown, is liable to be terminated at the pleasure of the Crown applies to civil as well as to military or naval service. A previous decision of the Court of Appeal in *Mitchell v. The Queen* appears in a note. In that case the Court held that all engage-