

which Act is operative in Canada, as in all other British Dominions, the King in council is empowered to make regulations for securing the public safety. In assumed pursuance of the Act an order in council was passed empowering the Secretary of State to order the internment of any person "of hostile origin or associations" where, on the recommendation of a competent naval or military authority, it appears to him expedient for securing the public safety, or defence of the realm: Reg. 14 B. Under this regulation the Secretary of State ordered the internment of one Arthur Zadig, a naturalized British subject of German birth and parentage. Zadig thereupon applied for a writ of habeas corpus, and on the hearing of the application before a Divisional Court (Lord Reading, C. J., and Lawrence, Rowlatt and Atkin, JJ.), the motion was refused, and on appeal to the Court of Appeal, (Eady, Pickford and Bankes, L.JJ.), the decision was affirmed. From this decision an appeal was had to the House of Lords (Lord Finlay, L. C., and Lords Dunedin, Atkinson, Shaw, and Wrenbury), and the decision has been affirmed, Lord Shaw dissenting. The contention of the appellant was that the regulation was *ultra vires* and not authorized by the statute, and an invasion of the liberty of the subject, but this argument did not prevail, except with Lord Shaw, who delivered what might almost be called a political harangue on what he conceives to be a gross attack upon the freedom of the people, and a revival of the methods of the Star Chamber.

DEFAMATION—LIBEL—PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION—EXCESS OF PRIVILEGE.

*Adam v. Ward* (1917) A.C. 509. This was an appeal to the House of Lords (Lord Finlay, L. C., and Lords Loreburn, Dunedin, Atkinson, and Shaw), from the judgment of the Court of Appeal (Buckley, Pickford, and Bankes, L.JJ.) The action was for libel in the following circumstances: The plaintiff, who was formerly an officer in a cavalry regiment, and was subsequently elected a member of Parliament, in a speech in the House of Commons charged that the General commanding the brigade, of which the plaintiff's regiment had formed part, had sent confidential reports to Headquarters on officers under his command, containing wilful and deliberate misstatements. The General in question referred the matter to the Army Council, of which the defendant was secretary, and he, by its direction, wrote a letter to the General vindicating him against the charge, and containing defamatory statements about the plaintiff, and also sent a copy