

position and rights of its subjects, is introduced in the parliament of the country where these bills have originated, they shall be submitted to the advisory body for consideration, unless this involves serious difficulties. The advisory body shall propose amendments to such clauses in the bills as may be thought to conflict with the interests of the other country or those of its subjects. This committee shall also frame bills aiming at cooperation between both countries and at conformity in their respective legislation and to take part in inter-Scandinavian cooperation in the sphere of legislation. The committee at present comprises 8 members and has up to now assembled once a year, alternately in Iceland and Denmark. — As regards the court of arbitration the act provides that if differences of opinion arise concerning the provisions of this act, which cannot be adjusted by the governments, the matter shall be laid before a court of arbitration consisting of four members, two to be appointed by the supreme court of each country. This court of arbitration shall settle the differences by majority of votes. But in case of a tie, the matter shall be submitted to an arbitrator appointed alternately by the Swedish and Norwegian governments.

Finally there are in this act provisions concerning the abrogation of the act; according to which either Althingi or the Rigsdag may, after the 31<sup>st</sup> of Dec. 1940 demand a revision of this act of union, and if negotiations do not result in a new treaty within three years from the submission of such a demand, either parliament may pass a resolution to the effect that the treaty contained in the act be abolished. But in order to make this resolution valid a two-thirds vote of either house of the Rigsdag and the same number of votes in the united Althingi is required. This resolution must subsequently be submitted to a referendum in which at least three-fourths of the parliamentary electorate exercise their vote, and three-fourths of the votes cast must be in favour of the abrogation of the treaty.

The union of Iceland and Denmark, according to the act of union, belongs to the domain of international, not constitutional, law. Both countries are sovereign states. Neither is superior to the other in the union, and there is no State superior to them. Whether the union is to be termed a personal union or a real union, depends on what conceptions these terms are intended to imply. If it is called a real union, it must be observed that it is an unusually loose one, as the two countries have no supreme authority of State in common except the king. The advisory committee is indeed common for both countries, but being only advisory, it cannot be looked upon as invested with constitutional power.