

are any other persons who—irrespective of the said legal provisions—are entitled to represent Finsterwalde before a Netherlands court and who object to commencing this action by Finsterwalde.—Under these circumstances Netherlands public policy does not prevent recognition of the authorisation by the controllers to start proceedings, even if the legal provisions upon which their powers rest, were to bear the confiscatory character which the grievance attributes to them.

*Note*

As the learned annotator of the above decision rightly observed, the Supreme Court confirmed its prior practice of not reviewing the merits of foreign legislation, but it applied the principles of public policy of the *forum* to it. Compare the Supreme Court's ruling in *Escomptobank v. de Nederlanden van 1845*, this *Review*, Vol. XIII (1966), p. 58

*Erratum*

In the report of *Constructa Werke G. m. b. H. v. de Geus en Uittenbogerd N.V.*, this *Review*, Vol. XII (1965), pp. 401-402, two additions should be made. On line 12 from the bottom of p. 401 insert between the words "action" and "since", "the latter Court". Read on the first line of p. 402 between the words "Court" and "deemed" "probably".

ERADES