

only of the Council or the Assembly of the League and in general only for the purpose of guiding the organs of the League or the International Labour Office in questions which come before those bodies in the execution of their duties. They are opinions only and in theory are not binding. Even in cases where an advisory opinion was asked for by the Council or the Assembly at the request of individual States which preferred to submit their disputes to judicial settlement through the machinery of an advisory opinion rather than by direct submission to the Court, the powers of the Council would not go beyond its general duty of securing respect for treaty engagements by ensuring that parties which submit their dispute for decision by a tribunal shall execute in good faith the decision which may be rendered. The power of the Council under Article 13, paragraph 4, in connection with awards or judicial decisions, is limited to 'proposing' measures for the purpose of giving effect to them. It cannot do more. It certainly could not oblige States to take measures which would violate their treaty engagements".

The draft Protocol was adopted by the Assembly without discussion, and was forthwith opened for signature. It has been signed by fifty States, namely:

South Africa,	France,	New Zealand,
Australia,	Germany,	Panama,
Austria,	Great Britain,	Paraguay,
Belgium,	Greece,	Peru,
Bolivia,	Guatemala,	Persia,
Brazil,	Haiti,	Poland,
Bulgaria,	Hungary,	Portugal,
Canada,	India,	Roumania,
Chile,	Irish Free State,	Salvador,
China,	Italy,	Siam,
Colombia,	Japan,	Spain,
Cuba,	Latvia,	Sweden,
Czechoslovakia,	Liberia,	Switzerland,
Denmark,	Luxembourg,	Uruguay,
Dominican Republic,	Netherlands,	Venezuela,
Estonia,	Nicaragua,	Jugoslavia.
Finland,	Norway,	

Proposal of the Government of Finland to Confer on the Permanent Court of International Justice Jurisdiction as a Court of Review in Respect of Arbitral Tribunals Established by States.

The Delegation of Finland felt that the very nature of jurisdiction made it essential that on certain conditions resort might be had to a higher authority than that which had rendered a disputed decision. It was pointed out that the aim of the proposal was to confer on the Court jurisdiction in regard to disputes relating to the absolute absence of jurisdiction of another tribunal, or in the case of another tribunal exceeding its powers. The proposal did not intend in any way to confer on the Court the functions of a judge of appeal. Where a court wrongly defined jurisdiction, it should be regarded as being of the same nature as cases where the court exceeded its powers. The Norwegian Delegate pointed out that, in the Finnish draft, it was proposed that specific jurisdiction should be given to the Court, a proceeding which would imply that the jurisdiction in question would be something entirely new, whereas in the case of States which were bound by Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, the Court was already vested with such jurisdiction. In certain cases, however, there were other treaty provisions which prevented its being exercised as between the parties. The Norwegian Delegation therefore proposed an amendment eliminating reference to giving specific jurisdiction to the Court.

The Assembly decided to invite the Council to submit to examination the question, "What would be the most appropriate procedure to be followed by States desiring to enable the Permanent Court of International Justice to assume