The exceptions to the rule that no action can be entertained by the court against a foreign sovereign, diplomatic agent, or similar person, are two, namely, if any such, having appeared before the court voluntarily, waives his privilege and submits to the jurisdiction of the court.²¹ It is, however, doubtful if submission by an ambassador to the jurisdiction of the court would be valid, because an old statute of Anne, called the Diplomatic Privileges Act,²² "prohibits and makes null and void the issue of any writ or process against an ambassador, and not merely writs or processes in the nature of writs of execution." The other apparent exception to the rule is that the court has jurisdiction to entertain an action against a person belonging to the suite of an ambassador or diplomatic agent, if such person engages in trade.—Law Quarterly Review.

MASTERS AND SERVANTS.

Some of the most elementary questions of law which occur almost every day, and on which a lawyer may at any unguarded moment be asked his opinion, are the most difficult to answer. Among these we must place questions between masters and servants. Custom or actual judicial decisions have, however, determined some of them.

For instance, "by a long and well-established custom, it is settled that, in the absence of any agreement to the contrary, the hiring of domestic and menial servants is for a year and subject to determination on a month's—*i.e.*, a calendar month's —notice by either master or servant, or on payment of a month's wages by the employer": (MacDonell's Law of Master and Servant, 2nd edit., p. 138). It has been urged that a further custom should now be recognized—namely, that the contract of service can be determined on either side at the end of the first

^{21.} See the judgment of Esher, M.R. and Lopes, L.J., in Mighell v. Sultan of Johore, cited supra, at pp. 149, 157, 160; but compare the judgment of Wright, J., in Musurus Bey v. Gadban, cited supra; Taylor v. Best, cited supra.

^{22. (1708) 7} Anne, c. 12.