

stripe of politics thought well to appoint a farmer, who possibly finding politics more paying than farming, became a member of the Provincial Parliament and then procured for himself the position of a County Court Clerk. Such instances might be largely multiplied. As we have often said, if the profession would stick together and insist, not merely their rights, but upon what is really decent in the premises, such outrageous appointments would not be made.

COMBATANTS AND NON-COMBATANTS.

As the civil population, however, becomes more and more involved in the direct conduct of the war, it seems much more likely that the tendency will be to confiscate private property belonging to the enemy. Under the latest system, whereby private individuals are detained and not permitted to leave the country, even for neutral destinations, and under which the receipt of dividends by persons in enemy countries is firmly controlled, we have something very like a temporary confiscation of enemy property. And no war-confiscation can be other than temporary: because permanent confiscations will always form the subject of discussion when the terms of peace are negotiated.

Both at sea and on land the dividing line between the combatant and the non-combatant is becoming blurred. Every citizen is an actual or a potential member of the Army Ordnance Corps. Every merchantman is an actual or potential scout or ram. The protection promised to the invaded populace, on condition of their remaining quiet, has proved illusory. The peaceful dweller at the seaside finds the proximity of a signal station or a railway line draws down on his villa a rain of naval shells. It seems really probable that the theoretical immunity of private property from confiscation, which in Napoleon's time Lord Ellenborough thought so unassailable (in *Wolff v. Orholm*), will not much longer be maintained.

But it is curious to reflect that, for all that, the nation in