

The testimony of witnesses was submitted in the form of depositions. There is no evidence that witnesses were cross-examined. In appealing one case, a litigant complains that one "evidence" is "only a Hearsay" (p. 653).

There were no separate Courts of Equity, but an early statute gave "the Bench" power to determine any equity cases, and the Suffolk records show that this power was frequently exercised. Chaffee concludes that "the Massachusetts Courts felt the necessity of doing more to compel specific performance and restitution than an English law Court would do, even though the colonial Courts did not give precisely the same relief as the English Chancery or impose so much pressure to bring about obedience to orders." (Introduction lv).

ARTHUR P. SCOTT*

A Collection of the Diplomatic and Consular Laws and Regulations of Various Countries. By A. H. Feller and Manley O. Hudson. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1933. 2 vol. Pp. 1505.

A "Research in International Law" conducted under the auspices of the Harvard Law School has, as its Director, Professor Manley O. Hudson, Professor of International Law in that school, and a widely recognized authority in that field. With his colleague, Professor Feller, he has written this work, just published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. It is intended as an up-to-date collection of the various laws and regulations concerning diplomatic privileges and immunities and the legal status and functions of consuls, etc., which might help toward a codification of the law in these regards. It is also intended to be of assistance in the current activities of diplomats and consuls, and in connection with the work of jurists and publicists. Assuredly the task could have been undertaken by none more competent. A more painstaking and successful work it would be hard to find. All available sources seem to have been drawn upon and the work gives us in English a full and accurate account of the laws and regulations on the subject of all civilized countries from Albania to Yugoslavia. There are added a list of treaties concerning consuls and a most satisfactory index. *Oh, si sic omnes!*

The information is almost wholly from official publications and is, consequently, perfectly reliable.

What are for us the most interesting portions are those dealing with the English-speaking nations, the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations. It is to be noticed that the authors, differing in that respect from most writers, recognize the essential change of status in the British Dominions. With most, Canadians are still subjects of England and the Governor-General actually takes part in the governing. Concerning the United States, the story begins with the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union of July 9, 1779 and is continued to the present—a full recapitulation of the provisions of statutes, regulations etc., is given in a practical order. In England, in the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is first dealt with. It is pointed out that the beginnings of English diplomatic intercourse are to be found in the 14th century. In 1327, the Bishop of Norwich was sent to France to negotiate a treaty; a Venetian Ambassador was sent to England in 1320; but the first permanent diplomatic representative sent

*Associate Professor of History, the University of Chicago.

to England was in 1487, when the King of Castille sent Roderigo Gondesalvi de Puebla to represent him.

One curious difference is to be found in the duties of the consuls of the two countries—the consul from Great Britain is given authority to solemnize marriage abroad, while the United States says: "A consular officer of the United States has no power to celebrate marriage in a Christian country between citizens of the United States unless specifically authorized by the laws of the country to do so. In non-Christian countries, his authority to perform this rite is not sufficiently well established and defined in the jurisprudence of the United States to justify action upon it. It is deemed safer to forbid consular officers, and they are hereby forbidden."

The several nations of the British Commonwealth of Nations are taken up *seriatim*, the different provinces of Canada receiving separate treatment, then the colonies and possessions followed by the territories under British mandate.

Some of the regulations governing consuls of other countries are, at least, interesting. Argentina directs its representative to "visit by card the mayor of the *municipio* of the Capital. These visits shall be returned by card within forty-eight hours." Chile determines precedence, *inter alia*, on "Personal conduct and qualifications for social life," and has three articles on the use of uniforms. Austria gives specific instructions as to what "are to be regarded as especially aggravated circumstances of an insult to honour." Colombia warns its consuls that committing an offence abroad, they will be punished in accordance with the provisions of the Code, ignorance of such provisions being no excuse. Bolivia calls for a knowledge of French and the language of the country to which sent. For certain diplomatic positions, Cuba requires the Degree of Doctor or *Licenciado* in Law; and forbids its representatives to engage in any business. To receive an appointment to a consular position, the Dominican Republic requires the applicant to "enjoy a respectable social position"; and has six articles on uniform, and three on "Precedence at Banquets." Ecuador has a whole Decree of Regulations for the Diplomatic Ceremonial and Egypt allows Consulates General to have four dragomans and four yassakdjis. Haiti provides for the appointment of a "Chief of Ceremony," and has two articles on "Funeral Honors." Hungary provides every Honorary Consul with "a flag, free of charge," but Liberia requires its representatives to "provide themselves with an escutcheon, flag, seal and . . . library," and does not omit to give definite instructions as to uniform. Mexico forbids relatives to serve in the mission. Venezuela is particular to direct its representatives not "to take part in any manner in the politics of the country . . . and they must abstain from all manifestations of opinion in the same." (If a certain British representative had borne the wisdom of this in mind, he would not have suffered the humiliation he did, when Washington spoke.) A consular official of the Netherlands may "take cognizance alone and without appeal of all claims against Netherlands subjects . . . when the claim amounts to no more than 75 florins"; but he of Nicaragua can only arbitrate "in a friendly way"; and, while the representative of Rumania can "judge all disputes among Rumanians," yet "Appeals from consular decisions are made before the Court of Appeal of Bucharest." Norway punishes crimes of a particular character committed against the envoy of a foreign State with a penalty increased by half, while Paraguay doubles the penalty, and San Marino does the same. *Quot homines, tot sententiæ.*

WILLIAM RENWICK RIDDELL*

*Justice of Appeal, Ontario.