

Objection was raised in the Conference to limiting the number of judges to fifteen, and the Polish representative desired to reserve the right of the Council and the Assembly to increase the number. His proposal was defeated after a vigorous speech had been made by the Canadian Delegate, who pointed out the possible evils which such a reservation might entail in the future. Opposition was also raised by certain Delegates to the recommendation dealing with the nomination of judges by the national groups, it being considered to be against the spirit of the Statute to dictate the procedure to be followed by national groups. In spite of this opposition both in the Conference and in the Assembly, the following recommendation was approved:

"The Conference recommends that, in accordance with the spirit of Articles 2 and 39 of the Statute of the Court, the candidates nominated by the national groups should possess recognized practical experience in international law and that they should be at least able to read both the official languages of the Court and to speak one of them; it also considers it desirable that to the nominations there should be attached a statement of the careers of the candidates justifying their candidature".

A further provision of the Statute, originating from the Government of Brazil, provides that countries which are not Members of the League will participate on an equal footing with Members of the League in the election of judges. The new Statute enters into force September 1, 1930, but the present members of the Court will continue under the existing Statute until their term of office expires on January 1, 1931. The Protocol for the Revision of the Court Statute has, so far, been signed by the forty-eight following States:—

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

Question of the Adherence of the United States of America to the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice

In presenting his Report to the Assembly, M. Politis (Greece), Rapporteur, reviewed the negotiations leading up to the present discussion and pointed out that no difficulty had at any time been felt with regard to the acceptance of the conditions laid down by the United States in the Senate resolution of January 27, 1926, in so far as they relate to advisory opinions. His statement on the question follows:—

"Misapprehension appears to exist in the United States as to the powers of the Council to give effect to the opinions rendered by the Court on questions submitted to it by the Council or the Assembly. It has, for instance, been suggested that the provisions of the concluding paragraph of Article 13 of the Covenant would enable the Council to oblige the Members of the League to resort to war for the purpose of enforcing such an opinion.

"This view is erroneous. The last paragraph of Article 13 relates only to awards or decisions, not to advisory opinions. Advisory opinions are given by the Court at the request