

removing any possible suggestion of discrimination against women. This proposal, on examination, was found to be impracticable and was ultimately withdrawn.

The draft resolution submitted to the Assembly calls the attention of Governments to the possibility of drafting laws which would bring their municipal laws into harmony with the Hague Convention, if they were prepared to accede thereto, in a form which would avoid discrimination between the sexes wherever it was possible to do so.

The proposals of the Austrian and French delegations, which were welcomed unanimously as supplementary to the Canadian proposal, were designed to indicate in what direction the League might usefully apply its activities in regard to the special question of the nationality of women.

In accordance with these proposals, the First Committee instructed the Secretary-General to request the Governments from time to time to submit information on the action that each of them may have taken on Recommendation No. VI of the Codification Conference. Furthermore, it requested the Council to keep itself constantly acquainted with the information received by the Secretariat and with the evolution of public opinion, so that it might be in a position to decide at what juncture new concerted international measures might be contemplated.

At the request of certain delegations the vote in the Assembly was taken by roll-call on the conclusions of the First Committee. Of the thirty-nine States voting, 30 delegations voted in favour of the resolution and 9 delegations abstained.

Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice

Although the Protocol of September 14, 1929, concerning the Revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court, did not enter into force on the date originally contemplated, the Assembly in 1930 accepted the view that it could subsequently come into force if the necessary ratifications were received.

When the Thirteenth Assembly met forty States, including Canada, had ratified the Protocol. Cuba had withdrawn the reservations originally attached to her ratification, and the United States of America had intimated that they saw no reason to object to the coming into force of the Protocol between such nations as might become parties thereto. But the ratifications necessary are those of all the States which have ratified the Protocol of Signature of December 16, 1920, and the following States which have ratified this Protocol had not yet ratified the Protocol of September 14, 1929: Abyssinia, Brazil, Chile, Lithuania, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The First Committee of the Thirteenth Assembly considered it important to make every effort to secure the early entry into force of the Protocol since the amendments set out in the annex to the Protocol are designed to secure important improvements in the jurisdiction and procedure of the Court. Some of them are designed to develop the activities of the Chamber of Summary Procedure and thus to provide States with a means of settling more rapidly disputes not regarded as of sufficient importance to justify a hearing before the Court as ordinarily constituted. Other amendments are designed to give to the advisory procedure of the Court under Article 14 of the Covenant the character of its ordinary jurisdiction. The Protocol also contains amendments designed to facilitate the appointment of judges to any vacancy which may occur during the term of office of a judge of the Court.

The committee therefore expressed the hope that States which have not yet ratified the Protocol would do so as soon as possible, and requested the Secretary-General to draw the attention of these States to the matter and to ask them to explain, in the event of their unwillingness to ratify, the nature of the difficulties which prevent them from doing so.