



1934

C.P.A. - Why not C.P.K.?/ World Court

North Dakota Law Review Associate Editors

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr>

Recommended Citation

North Dakota Law Review Associate Editors (1934) "C.P.A. - Why not C.P.K.?/ World Court," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 10: No. 7, Article 5.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol10/iss7/5>

This Note is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in North Dakota Law Review by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

REAL NEWS TO LAWYERS

We are indebted to the Los Angeles Bar Association Bulletin for the copy of the initiated constitutional amendment proposed in California, which would completely destroy the practice of law as a profession, and open wide the gates to every Tom, Dick and Harry. It is said the movement to "put over" this amendment is amply financed, and has the backing of bankers, real estaters, land-titlers, insurance writers, merchants, auto clubs and public-trusters. The amendment reads:

"No person shall be prohibited from giving legal advice or from drawing instruments where no appearance or proceeding in court is involved, and where such services are rendered gratuitously and not as a business or vocation. No person shall be prohibited or restricted from giving legal advice, formulating or drafting instruments or documents of whatever kind, or from doing other acts of a legal character, for or without compensation, when connected with, necessary, incidental or related to the development or conduct of any lawful business in which such person may be engaged, or the creation of any lawful relationship to which he may be a party in his individual or in any fiduciary or other capacity.

"Bona fide non-profit associations or corporations shall not be prohibited or restricted from employing duly licensed attorneys at law to advise or represent in court or elsewhere such associations or corporations or their members. No person acting for himself or in a fiduciary or representative capacity or as assignee of a claim shall be prohibited or restricted from appearing in court through duly licensed attorneys at law in his own behalf or on behalf of the interest, trust, estate or claim represented by him whether or not such attorneys are in his employ. There shall be no discrimination against such attorneys because of their employment to do the things referred to in this section, and no classification which will differentiate between attorneys so employed and those engaged in the practice of law generally.

"As used herein the word 'person' means individual, association, corporation or partnership."

Again, we join President Anderson of the Los Angeles Bar Association, and say: "The Bar has a voice; use it."

C.P.A.—WHY NOT C.P.K.?

We have C.P.A., why not C.P.K.? It was the suggestion of a "wag," originally, but we now amplify it. We advocate recognition of kidnaping as an expert, skilled business; and, believing it to be "affected with a public interest," we suggest invoking the "general welfare" clause, applying the "police power," and enacting a new law that will legalize the business, define terms, prevent monopoly, provide for examinations, establish license fees, promulgate rules and regulations, create a Board of Compliance, and grant Commissions as Certified Public Kidnapers (C.P.K.).

WORLD COURT

The American Bar Association is continuing its efforts to obtain adherence to the World Court by the United States. Mr. Clarence E. Martin, President 1933, recently made this statement to the Foreign Relations Committee of the U. S. Senate: "It is the deliberate judgment of the American Bar Association that the national honor and the national welfare require the entrance of the United States into the Permanent Court of International Justice."