North Dakota Law Review

Volume 17 | Number 3 Article 2

1940

Invitation

North Dakota State Bar Association

(Continued Frome First Page)

and unjust, is government by men and not government by law. It is Roman administrative law. When a legislative body has set up such a system it finds it difficult to undo what it has done, because the chief executive has the power of veto.

Mr. Roosevelt takes the view of the other social planners that you can't conduct administrative government affecting all the affairs of the people if you permit the people to carry their appeals into a court for a review of the facts and of the rulings based upon them. Government business has become the biggest business in the country and affects all other business, determining conduct and the relations of one person to another. Executive authority demands freedom from the restraints which the courts of law put upon it.

That is another way of saying that such a government is a dictatorship and must work as one. If administrative law is in the hands of fair minded men its operation may be as fair as circumstances will permit, but whether it is fair or unfair its word is final and if it does an injustice the injury is without a legal remedy. This theory is contrary to all previous thinking of the American people who, until they were taken in hand by the New Deal, had been careful to preserve for each man his day in court.

The new system of administrative law and the old system of protected liberties can't live together. It's quite apparent now which one is getting the worse of it.

SEC.

INVITATION

The members of the Association are invited to attend a conference of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals to be held at the United States Court House in St. Louis, Mo., on March 7th, 1941. An open session will be held, at which time Justice Bolitha J. Laws, of the District Court of the District of Columbia, will deliver an address on Pretrial Procedure and Henry P. Chandler, director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, will also deliver an address.

CASE NOTES—CONTRACTS TO ADOPT

In the United States adoption exists only by statute, and apparently the general rule is that the statute must be strictly construed and followed. In re Session's Estate, 70 Mich. 297, 38 N. W. 249 (1888); In re Estate of Williamson, 205 Iowa 772, 218 N. W. 469 (1928). However, because of the hardships which may arise from such a rule, courts have in many instances liberalized, if not, substantially altered its effect. Rockford v. Bailey, 322 Mo. 1155, 17 S. W. (2d) 941 (1929). In some jurisdictions substantial compliance is held to be sufficient.

It is said that adoption, being recognized by statute is no longer contrary to public policy as at common law, and that if an express promise of inheritance is enforceable, it necessarily re-