

the £14,000, that the claimants would have to prove their title at their own expense, and that it was doubtful what they would receive.

DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITIES.—The suite of ambassadors seem in some cases to presume unduly on the hospitable reception accorded to the principals in this country. On June 3 a magistrate was obliged to refuse a bastardy summons on the ground that the person alleged to be the putative father was a valet to the Japanese Minister, and, as such, entitled to the benefit of the Diplomatic Privileges Act, 1708 (7 Anne c. 12). Mr. Heard, in his 'Curiosities of Legal Reporting' (Boston, Mass., 1881), records a somewhat different result to a similar application. In 1768 a woman appeared before justices to swear a child on the secretary to Count Bruhl, the Saxon Minister, but the Court interfered and the justices were afraid to proceed. The woman applied to Sir Fletcher Norton (soon afterwards Attorney-General), who advised application for a peremptory *mandamus* to proceed with the affiliation. Lord Mansfield suggested application to the Attorney-General or the Foreign Minister for redress; whereupon Sir Fletcher Norton bearded the great judge and asserted his client's right as a subject to apply to the Court. Two of the judges were in favour of the grant of the motion; but we cannot trace the case further. So far as it goes, it is against the diplomatic immunity of a putative father. We would suggest that it is doubtful whether the Act of Anne was intended to do more than protect diplomatists and their suite from arrest on *mesne* process in civil proceedings. But in practice, undoubtedly, they are excused from liability to any process or taxation. Cabmen who are bilked by *attachés* cannot get a summons, and a *soi-disant* diplomatist some years since successfully claimed immunity in answer to an offence against the Hyde Park regulations, while the coroners have twice been foiled in attempts to hold inquests, once on a Chinese baby, and in the other case on a member of the Chinese Embassy who killed himself outside its curtilage. In the last two cases no doubt the English law might have taken a barbarous view of Celestial ethics; but in the preceding cases there seemed no violation of national independence in requiring a cab to be paid for or police regulations to be observed. We should not nowadays allow the retinue of the French and Spanish ambassadors (as Charles II. did) to have a pitched battle in the London streets for precedence of audience (*Pepys*, September 30, 1661).—*Law Journal* (London).